

A N

Epistolary Discourse,

Proving, from the
Scriptures and the First Fathers,
THAT THE

S O U L

Is a Principle *Naturally Mortal*:

But Immortalized Actually: by the
Pleasure of God to Punishment; or, to Reward
by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit.

Wherein is Proved,

That None have the Power of Giving this Divine
Immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only the
BISHOPS.

With an Hypothesis concerning *Sacerdotal Absolution*.

The Second Edition Corrected.

By HENRY DODWELL, A. M.

That better part of us—in and after Death doth exist and live, either by virtue of its Spiritual and Immortal Nature, as we believe; or, at least, the Will of God and his Power upholding and preserving it from Dissolution, as many of the Fathers thought. Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Art. V. p. 235, 236. 5th Edit. Lond. 1683.

LONDON: Printed for R. Smith, at the Angel and Bible, without Temple-Bar, MDCCVI.

®
SOLD BY ORDER OF
LAMBETH PALACE LIBRARY



I
C
I
nu
m
ev
no
I
ex
G
cu
ac
bo
th
ap
O
m
en
za

To the Honourable

CHARLES HATTON, Esq;

I Take this Occasion, Honoured Sir, of leaving a Publick Monument of my Gratitude, for the many Favours you have shewn me ever since the time I had the Honour of being known to you. And I cannot but congratulate that exemplary Zeal for the Publick Good, which has been so conspicuous in your whole Conduct, and adds a very graceful Lustre to your honourable Extraction. But in nothing has this Publick Zeal more appeared, than in, the properest Object of Zeal, the Cause of God, and of Religion. This you have embraced, not only as a Cognizance of a Party (which too many

content themselves with) but as a Guide of your Life. And that as well in the suffering Duties of it, as those which might have recommended you to the Esteem of Men, and have increased your worldly Honour. This is indeed to lay out the Talents, with which God has intrusted you, in a way most acceptable to him, by whom you are intrusted with them. And though it hinder your worldly Progress, yet the Rewarder of your Faith will abundantly recompence you for it. It is a Title to much better Rewards, not to have received your good things here. A Title, to have been like our Saviour in his Sufferings. A Title, to have lived the Life of Faith in the midst of a backsliding unbelieving Generation. And much more rewardable where it is more rare. Nor do the worldly Benefits lost by the Discharge of a good Conscience, bear any

DEDICATION.

v

*any Proportion to the Rewards of
relinquishing them. No Saint in
Heaven thinks his Glories dearly
purchased. None is there who
would not be glad to have the Op-
portunity of adding to his present
Fruitings, by Difficulties far great-
er than ever exercised the Patience
of the most glorious Martyr. Yet
our good Lord has not so been plea-
sed to try our Faith, as to leave us
wholly to the Rewards reserved for
us, when our Faith shall be turned
into Fruition. The same Piety
which intitles us to our future In-
heritance, has the Promises of this
Life also. Our Sufferings even
here, have such an alloy of Sup-
ports and Fruitings, to those who
resign themselves entirely to the
Divine Conduct, as are sufficient,
not to make them tolerable only,
but desirable also, though there
had been nothing further reserved
for us. Such are, the Satisfaction*

of our own Consciences, the Joys of the Heavenly Spirit, the Applause of good Men, the Reverence of even Adversaries, a fearless Concern for unavoidable Events, a confident Acquiescence in the Providence of him for whose Cause the Sufferings are undertaken, and a comfortable Expectation of that King of Terrors, who makes even the present Enjoyments of Sinners very formidable. These Considerations make the Rewards of Sufferings for Christ, in this Life, abundantly recompensed, though there had been no further recompense to be expected hereafter. So our Lord, manifold more in this Life, St. Luk. xviii. 30. An hundred fold now in this time, Houses, and Brethren, and Sisters, and Mothers, and Children, and Lands, with Persecutions, St. Mark x. 30. The Meaning is plainly this: That the Satisfaction of Mind,
even

DEDICATION.

vii

even under Losses undertaken for a good Conscience, is, even in this Life, disproportionably greater than what could have been expected from the Fruitions of the things themselves which are lost in Maintenance of a good Conscience. The worldly Wise dare not trust their Redeemer's Word for this. Nor do they qualifie themselves for knowing it experimentally. The Cross is Folly, not only to the Gentile World, but to the degenerous Professors of it in Words, whilst they do, at the same time, in their Works deny it. Yet this is the Wisdom to which you have given up your Name. This is the truest Wisdom, the Wisdom from above, which teaches you to remember your latter End, and to be wise unto Salvation. . A little time will convince its present Adversaries of their own Folly in deserting it. God give them Grace

DEDICATION.

to do it while they may reap the Benefit of its Instruction, before it can serve for no other end but that of aggravating their Punishment of Loss, and the intolerable Remorse of their too late awaken'd Consciences ! I doubt not but that you will join in this charitable Office with

Shottesbrook,
Jan. 21. 170 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Your most obliged

A N D

Grateful Beneficiary,

Henry Dodwell.

A P R Æ -

A

PRÆMONITION.

THAT the Reader may the better understand the following *Discourse*, I thought it requisite to transcribe the Passages here alluded to, out of the *Letters* that *occasioned* it. They were in all *two*; and both of them from an excellent Person, but as yet unknown to me.

The Fragments of the Letters which occasioned the following Discourse.

In the *former* he has these Words:

‘ In the first place, I own that to derive the Immortality and spiritual Nature of the Soul, together with that Angelical Perfection and Happiness (for which the Members of the Church stand Candidates in this Life, to which they have an unquestionable Title in this Life, and of which they shall be possess’d in the other World) from an Interest in the Covenant with God, doth greatly enhance the value of the Covenant. It renders it which was made with *Adam*, renew’d with *Setb*, and retriev’d by Jesus Christ, most

A PRÆMONITION.

' most Illustrious, most Worthy of God,
 ' of his Son, of the Holy Trinity, most
 ' Honourable, most Comfortable to Man.
 ' The *Jewish* Church, with all its Types,
 ' Prophecies, Figures, &c. is ennobled by
 ' being a shadow of the Christian Church,
 ' which, by the inseparable Connexion
 ' with that in Heaven, is none other than
 ' a Polity of Angelick Men, undergoing a
 ' short Discipline here on Earth, under the
 ' Regiment and Tuition of God and his
 ' Son, with, and to, whom they are uni-
 ' ted by the Holy Ghost. Besides, if the
 ' Immortality of the Soul derives only
 ' and meerly from the Covenant; I think
 ' the perplexing Difficulties about the Im-
 ' putation of Original Sin, the Traducti-
 ' on of the Soul, &c. will evanish. God
 ' will be justified in all his Proceedings
 ' with Men since the Fall of *Adam*, because
 ' the innumerable Millions of Men, who
 ' sprung out of his Loins, are not damn'd,
 ' (as is vulgarly believ'd) but only de-
 ' priv'd of a Privilege which was the effect
 ' of his Covenanting with Men, and which
 ' Covenant was the effect of pure Grace.
 ' From this Hypothesis also the Grace of
 ' God, through Jesus Christ, doth shine
 ' forth most gloriously. Inasmuch as that
 ' after the breach of the Covenant once
 ' and again, he yet should have renew'd
 ' it with *Abraham* and his Seed, and after-
 ' wards

wards have sent his Son into our Nature, and to this lower World to invite all Men into it. Moreover this Hypothesis may, in a great measure, serve to clear up the perplex'd Disputes about God's Decrees, wherewith the Church hath been often and much vex'd. It serves to these and many other good Purposes. [Those words relate to what I had said in my Discourse concerning *Marriages* out of the *Peculium*, and in my second *Letter of Advice for Theological Studies*.]

Afterwards he goes on thus : ' But then it hath against it all the Arguments which Christian Philosophers have advanced in the Pneumatics against the Atheists and Deists. It ascribes to Matter the most stupid of things the Divine and Spiritual Qualities of Thought and Reflection, of Liberty and Consciousness, and will force us to ascribe all the Contemplations, Sagacity, Science, yea and Virtues of all who are not within a true Episcopal Communion, to the force of meer Mechanism. For I can conceive of no created thing, at least, but of Spirit, Matter and Motion. Yet this should be no hindrance to my Assent (though it be full as unintelligible as Transubstantiation) if God had told us of it in his Word, That none, but such as are with-
' in

' in the Christian Covenant, have a Prin-
 ' ciple of Immortality. The wise Man,
 ' *Eccl. iii. 21.* ascribeth the Spirit to Man
 ' as such. It is confess'd, that *Abraham*,
 ' and the Inspired Men under the Law are
 ' Immortal, because the Spirit by whom
 ' they were inspired, made them such.
 ' And if these extraordinary Influences of
 ' the Spirit convey'd such a Virtue unto a
 ' thing otherwise mortal, what shall we
 ' say of the Waters on which the Spirit
 ' mov'd? What of *Balaam's Ass*? May it
 ' not be thought, that as much stress may
 ' be laid on one of our Saviour's Parables
 ' as on any thing in all the Heathen My-
 ' thology? And it's obvious that *Dives*,
 ' whom we may presume not to have
 ' been an inspired Person, is supposed to
 ' exist, and that in no good condition,
 ' after Death. And indeed that Parable
 ' will amount to nothing, unless it prove
 ' the Happiness of a good, and the Misery
 ' of even a bad, *Jew* after Death. The
 ' New Testament seems to threaten the Pu-
 ' nishment of the other World to an obsti-
 ' nate *Jew*. 'Tis true that some learn'd
 ' Interpreters make the weeping and gnash-
 ' ing of Teeth, *Matth. viii. 12.* and the
 ' everlasting Destruction and flaming Fire,
 ' *2 Thes. i. 8, 9.* to mean no other thing
 ' but Temporal Calamity. Particularly,
 ' that which was inflicted on the *Jews* at
 ' the

the Destruction of their Temple and City. But this weeping and gnashing of Teeth is opposed to the sitting down with *Abraham, &c.* in the Kingdom of Heaven. And therefore should, by the Rules of good Logick, mean some other thing than Temporal Calamities. In the other place, the unquenchable Fire is denounc'd against those who obey not the Truth, who are the very same *Jews* who troubled the Christian *Theſſalonians*, v. 6. And those may have as truly been the persecuting *Jews* as the Christian *Gnosticks*. And, if so, then the *extra-peculium* *Jews* are awarded to everlasting Destruction; and consequently are to be reckon'd Immortal. And if these unquenchable Flames, and everlasting Destruction denote not the Punishments of the future State, why should these and the like Expressions signify it in other places? May not the Enemies of Religion clap such a figurative Gloss on all those places which signify the Punishments of Hell? Our Lord is stiled a Redeemer, a Saviour. And it would seem that these Legal Names had a reference to Legal Sentences past against Man. Now if our natural Death results from our natural Constitution (which it must do upon this Principle) Jesus Christ cannot be called our Redeemer, in a strict and proper Sense,

A PRÆMONITION.

Sense, by vouchsafing the Resurrection of
 our Body. And, in no Sense, can he be
 called Jesus, or the Saviour of Men (those
 of the *Segullah* excepted) with respect to
 Hell. Because none, save the Members
 of the Church are supposed capable of
 any such Punishment. With respect to
 Mankind in general, he may properly
 be called a Benefactor. But I do not see
 how the Name of Redeemer or Saviour
 can be attributed to him. And yet the
 Apostle stiles him the Saviour of all
 Men, especially of such as believe. And
Rev. xxi. 8. the Unbelievers and Idolaters
 are doom'd to Brimstone, &c. which is
 called the second Death, which one
 would think were no Apostates, but such
 as never had been within the Church.
 And *Mark xvi. 16.* As they who believ'd
 and were baptiz'd were sav'd, so they
 who did not believe were damned. Does
 Damnation here mean no other thing
 but a meer Privation of a glorious Im-
 mortality? And, if it signifies any thing
 else, this Hypothesis falls to the Ground.
 If it means no other thing, then the De-
 spisers and virulent Opposers of the Go-
 spel will be in no worse Case than an
American who never heard of it. The
 great Judgment is represented as Univer-
 sal, and not confin'd to those within the
 Covenant. To be sure *St. Paul* must
 have

A PRÆMONITION.

XV

have reason'd so with *Felix* and the *Athenians*. For how could the first have trembled, unless he had suppos'd himself comprehended? Or how could the Apostle's Argument have been conclusive, had he suppos'd them, whilst out of the *Peculium*, to be meer Mortals? If this Principle be true, the Apostle could not, indeed no Man can, fairly persuade any Man to become a Member of the Church, from any Motive of Fear of future Punishments. And yet it has been the most powerful in effecting a Change, more forcible than that of future Rewards. If the Laws of the Land did not punish such as keep back their Children from Baptism, the Hopes of future Rewards (when their not being entred into the *Peculium* secures them from the Fears of everlasting Misery) would not prevail with many of them.

I do not comprehend what is laid down in that Book about the Divine Seed. It is represented sometimes as a vital Principle; and other while as a Subsistence distinct from the Rational Soul; and then, as if it were the Holy Ghost himself. Care should be taken in expressing such matters, that the weak be not scandaliz'd. Now, whatever be the manner of the Holy Ghost's Inhabitation, yet it's certain that, so long as we are in
the

A PRÆMONITION.

‘ the Body, we want repeated Assistances
 ‘ of the Holy Spirit, which is evident
 ‘ from every good Man’s Experience. And
 ‘ unless this be granted, Prayer for Increase
 ‘ of Grace is to no purpose.

‘ Your charitable Assistance, to help me
 ‘ through such Difficulties, is earnestly de-
 ‘ sired.

In the second Letter he writes thus :

D. B.

‘ Allow me to beg your Assistance in a
 ‘ matter which not only nearly concerneth
 ‘ me, but also this poor afflicted Church
 ‘ and Clergy. It is evident that this vast
 ‘ Defection from the Communion Episco-
 ‘ pal is, in a great part, owing to our Ig-
 ‘ norance of the true Notions both of a
 ‘ Church and Clergy. To rectify this po-
 ‘ pular and dangerous Error, some late Wri-
 ‘ tings had contributed, and many were
 ‘ coming over to the Communion of the
 ‘ Church, and consequently in the road
 ‘ of becoming serious Christians. But
 ‘ these our Hopes are very much damp’d
 ‘ by the opposition that is made by the
 ‘ *Bourignonists*, who make light of Order
 ‘ Civil and Ecclesiastical. They bear it
 ‘ high, at St. *Andrew’s* especially. And
 ‘ the rather, because the Students were
 ‘ like to come over to Church-Principles
 ‘ They

A PRÆMONITION.

xvii

They boast as if *Poirot* had worsted Mr. *Dodwell*. I know not of any such thing done by Mr. *Poirot*. Yet this very Boast staggers unsettled Youth. It were therefore worth the while to vindicate the Church against the Cavils of those Enthusiasts, who are likely in a short time to prove more dangerous than the Presbyterians, the last not being so much supported by the Populace as by the secular Arm.

Mr. *Dodwell*, in a Book upon Marriages, makes the Immortality of the Soul to be the effect of the Divine Spirit, which he restrains to them within the Covenant, and by consequence all without the Christian Covenant (ordinarily) have no Principle of Immortality. This Assertion hath done much harm, it being considered as a Notion advanced both against the Catholick Principles of the Soul's Immortality, and Antiscriptural. We are put hard to it in his Defence. For it is told us, that the Children of the Kingdom, *Matth. viii. 12.* were the *Jews*, to whom Mr. *Dodwell* allows no more than a Title to the Spirit in reversion (except to such of them as were inspired) and yet they are said to be cast into outer Darkness, which even he confesses to signify the Punishment of the after State. We are told

a

that

' that the Day which is appointed for
 ' judging the World in Righteousness, per
 ' *Act. xviii. 31.* is the Day of Judgment. ma
 ' And, if so, those, with whom the A. of
 ' posse disputed, were to be judged. he
 ' And if they were to be judged, they are
 ' had a Principle of Immortality, even or
 ' though without the Covenant. The con
 ' Scripture tells us, that it's appointed my
 ' for all Men once to dye, and after that my
 ' the Judgment. And thence they infer wh
 ' that the Judgment must be *æquè late Tho*
 ' *patens* as the Death. The Judgment coun
 ' threatned against *Chorazin* and *Bethsaida*, son
 ' is said to be more intolerable than that is p
 ' of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*. And I do not lity
 ' think that the Calamity of *Judæa*, when the
 ' that Nation and Polity was destroy'd, con
 ' came up to that of *Sodom*. One would lie
 ' think that the resisting of the Holy Ghost, of
 ' at the rate the *Jews* did, was a Sin much no
 ' more heinous than a wilful unrepented gun
 ' Immorality committed by a Christian, aga
 ' and that therefore the Righteous Judge spir
 ' of the World would not damn the lat due
 ' ter to endless exquisite Torments, when talin
 ' the other suffers no more than a tempo latio
 ' ral and bodily Punishment, &c. Old
 Tim
 now
 pur
 rit's

April xxiv. 1705.

By these things the Reader will easily
 perceive how much this worthy Gentle-
 man is *mistaken*, when, from the *Doctrine*
 of the *natural Mortality* of *Humane Souls*,
 he infers the *actual Mortality* of all that
 are out of the *Peculium* by their own fault;
 or indeed of any one *single Person*, who is
 concerned in *this Case*. That neither is
 my *Opinion*, nor is any just *Consequence* of
 my *Principles*; as he will easily find
 when he has been pleased to consider my
Thoughts delivered in the following *Dis-*
course. I do not think that any *adult Per-*
son whatsoever, living where *Christianity*
 is *professed*, and the *Motives* of its *Credibi-*
lity are sufficiently *proposed*, can hope for
 the *Benefit* of *Actual Mortality*. On the
 contrary, I have proved all such *Unbe-*
lievers liable to the *Condemnatory Sentence*
 of the *General Judgment*. I am therefore
 no more concerned for the *Gentleman's Ar-*
guments of this kind, than *himself*. He is
 again *mistaken*, when he reckons all *In-*
spired Persons in the *Old Testament* as en-
 dued *actually* with the *Principle* of *Immor-*
*tal*ity. That is perfectly *against* the *Reve-*
lations of the *New Testament*, and of the
Old Testament also, which relate to the
Times of the *New Testament*. I must not
 now repeat what I have produced to this
 purpose in this *Discourse* it self. The *Spi-*
rit's moving on the Face of the Waters will

2.
 The Gen-
 tleman
 mistakes
 my Hypo-
 thesis, when
 he takes it
 to suppose
 the actual
 Mortality
 of all who
 are out of
 the Pec-
 ulium.

no more make the *Waters immortal*, than his *Omnipresence* as *GOD* will make all things so. If it would, there would be *nothing* mortal and corruptible, because *nothing* can *subsist* without the all-sustaining *Spirit*. Which if it had, it must be *immortal*, if its *presence*, in *any sense*, had been alone sufficient for *Immortality*. But I need not here repeat what I have said in the following Discourse, for proving, that the *Immortalizing Presence* of the *Spirit* is, in the current of the *New Testament*, supposed *not* to have been given to any, since the *loss* of it by the Fall of Mankind, till the *Resurrection* of our *Lord*, who had the *disposal* of it, as being inhabited, with the *fullness* of the *Spirit*; of which *fullness*, all others are to *receive* their several Proportions respectively, *S. Joh. i. 16*. This is the *Scripture-account* of that *Immortality* which may only seem to *deserve* the Name of *Immortality*; that is, of the *Immortality of Happiness*.

3. *Perpetual Punishment*, in the *Scripture* Phrase, is rather reckoned as a *Death* than a *Life*. That is the *second*, and more *afflictive* Death. And therefore the *prolonging* of the duration is not taken for *Life*, nor a *Favour*. Nor is it according to the *Divine Spirit*, which is the Original of the *Diviner Life*, and the *Pleasure* of God, than to the *Divine Spirit*.

The actual-
ly Immor-
talizing
Souls to
Punish-
ment, may
possibly be
better as-
cribed to
the Plea-
sure of God,

tho

those *præternatural* Favours, which are called *Grace*, and are all derived from that same *Spirit*. The *Original* therefore of that *Immortality*, if it may be so called, may be more agreeably derived from the *Divine Pleasure*, than from the *nature* of *Soul* which is thus to be *immortalized*. So *Plato* accounts for it. And so *S. Justin Martyr*, who lived *nearest* to the *Age* of the *Apostles*, in his words here produced. And it serves alike for the *end* and *terror* of such a *Punishment*, that the *Soul* be *actually* perpetuated; whether that *Perpetuity* be ascribed to the *nature* of the *Soul* itself, or whether *God* be *pleased* to *continue* the duration of it beyond the *exigency* or *power* of its own *nature*. Provided that timely *warning* may be given to all that are concerned in it, and the *Consequences* of it, by *Divine Revelation*; which is the only *Rational Means* for *notifying* the *Divine Pleasure*, in *Facts* entirely *depending* on the *Divine Pleasure*. And that *Revelation* will then be more *credible*, when it is *agreeable* to the *Nature* concerned in it, which is *naturally inclined* to *believe* it; as being at *first* ennobled with a *Divine Original*, and *designed* by *God* as a *Candidate* for *Immortality*, as a *Reward* of the good *Use* of his own *Free Will*. This the *Soul* has from the *νοῦς* and *Flatus*, distinct from the *πνεῦμα* or *Spirit* given

in *Baptism* to *Favourites* only, of the true *Peculium*. This intitles it to be, in some sense, a *Divine Offspring* in a *higher* sense than the *Souls* of any other *Sublunary Animals*. Yet it will not necessarily make them *naturally Immortal*, any more than those many other *Creatures* made immediately by *God*, without any *design* of *qualifying* them for even a *præternatural Immortality*. Yet it may *recommend* them to a *Divine Concern* for them more than for those other *Creatures* which *never* had the *Honour* done them, that might any way *intitle* them to that *Care of God* for them, which becomes a *Parent* to his own *Offspring*. And as *God* has thus admitted them to *præternatural Felicities*, as *Rewards* of their *Duty* to him; so he may oblige them to make a *prudent choice*, of what is otherwise their own *Interest*, by threatening *Punishments* of a like nature, *præternatural* and *perpetual*, if their *Interest* can not alone prevail on them to make that *Choice*. And, having *threatned* them, his *Veracity*, as well as his *Justice*, will oblige him to *perform* his *Threats*, as well as his *Promises*. And all this may be the *Effect* of a *Paternal Good-will*, when it is done with a *design* of *Kindness* to every *Individual Subject* of his *Government*, as well as that of *securing* the *Body* itself, and the good *Government* of it (which is also the *Interest*).

Interest of all Particulars) against the *mis-*
chief that might follow from the *undiscipli-*
ned Use of extravagant *Free Wills*. On these
Terms he may *continue* their *duration*, to
qualify them for more *lasting Punishments*,
who *would* not *otherwise* qualify themselves
for the more lasting *præternatural Rewards*
which he had *designed* for them.

God did indeed *raise up Pharaoh* for an
example, and is said to have *made the*
Wicked for the day of Evil. So the Old
Testament represents the Case in regard of
exemplary *temporal Punishments*, which
were the *only Punishments* then *known*, ei-
ther by *Reasonings*, or even the *Divine Re-*
velations of that *Time*. But God was so
far from *predestinating* Men to *Eternal*
Punishments, that the *Revelations* of even
the *New Testament* itself represent *those Pu-*
nishments as *not* prepared for *Men*, but
only for the *Devil and his Angels*. If
therefore those *Angels*, who were *naturally*
immortal, had not *fallen*, there had been no
Hell at all. And *Mankind* is no *otherwise*
concerned in it, by this Scripture-account
of it, than as, by *joining* themselves to
the *Devil's Party*, they intitle themselves
to those *Punishments* which were *prepared*
for the *Devil* and his *Associates*. No, nor
even by being *subject* to the *Devil*, on ac-
count of their being within that *Juris-*
diction which had been, by *Providence*,

4.
The Souls
that are
common to
all Men,
do not so
depend on
our gross
organical
Bodies, as
that they
must ne-
cessarily
perish on
their dis-
solution
from their
Bodies.

allotted to him *before* his *fall*, and which was still *allowed* him *after* his *expulsion* from *Heaven*. But under such *restrictions* of his *Malignancy*, as the *Divine Goodness* was pleased to *lay* upon him, for the *good* of the *Sublunary Creatures*. The *effect* of their *fall* into this *subcœlestial district* had only been, that they would have been liable to the *vanity*, the *corruption*, the *mortality*, of the *place* to which their *fall* had reduced them, in the *region* of *darkness* and *shadow* of *death*; the *power* of which the *Scripture* still assigns to the *Devil*. The consequence therefore of his *Fall alone*, was so far from making *Men* liable to *Eternal Punishments*, that it made them *incapable* of them, by *reducing* them to that *finite duration* which was *natural* to them, and which could not be avoided but by an *accession* of that nobler *præternatural Principle*, with which *God* was pleased to favour *Man* above all other *Corporeal Beings*; that of the *Divine* *ἄνω* or *Flatus*, as *contradistinct* from the more properly *Divine* *πνεῦμα*, or *Spirit*. This made a difference between *Men* and the *Beasts that perish*: That the *Spirit* of the *Beasts* went *downwards*, as *falling on the Earth*, signifies *perishing* in the *Stile* of the *Holy Scriptures*; but the *Spirit* of *Man* went *upwards*, returning to the *Lord* that gave it, that is, into the *Air*, the *Ἄδης* of *Humane Souls*. This plainly supposes it

not to depend on our gross Organical Bodies,
nor therefore to perish upon its dissolution
from those Bodies. And the same is suppo-
 sed when our *Souls* are said to depend on
 the *Pleasure* of the *God* that first *breathed*
 them into us, as the *Fathers* here mention-
 ed, say they do. The meaning of that
 Expression cannot be, that it is in his Power
 and Pleasure to *annihilate* them when he
 thinks fit. That is not *peculiar* to our
Souls, but *common* to them with *all* created
 Beings whatsoever, even *Angels*, and the
most perfect Creatures, however pretending
 to an *Immortality* of their own *Nature*. The
 meaning therefore must be, that they do
 not so depend on any *other created Being*,
 but that they may *still* continue in their
 duration, whatsoever other *created* Influ-
 ences be *withdrawn* from them, if *God* be
 pleased *still* to continue that *Ordinary Pro-*
vidence which is essentially *necessary* for
 their *continuance*, who can no more *conti-*
nue than *give* their own *Being*. Withal, as
 it is a *Flatus*, it implies a more *immediate*
Dependence on *God*, as the *Breather* of it,
 than *other* Creatures, which must make it
cease to be, whenever he is pleased to *cease*
 to *breath* it, as being *unable* to *continue* its
 own Duration by the *Powers* given it at its
 first *Production*, and the *continuance* of those
 general *Influences* which are requisite for the
 support of *Created Beings* in general. This
 makes

makes its *Immortality* perfectly *Arbitrary*. And by this *God* put it in the Power of *Adam* to have *immortalized* himself by his *Obedience*, Not that the *Flatus* was it self *Immortal*, though independent on its *Organical Body*; but because that aloſe would have enabled him to have *laid hold* on the *Diviner Spirit*, a *Union* with which would have actually *immortalized* him. However its *independency* on the *Body* is ſufficient to overthrow the modern *Paradox* of the *ψυχοπαύχια* confuted by *Calvin* in the *Anabaptiſts*, though now lately revived in our own Age, ſo unhappy for *Innovating Paradoxes*. Theſe pretend the *Soul* to die actually with the *Body*, and to *riſe* again with it at the general *Reſurrection*. But this very Opinion was confuted by *Origen*, and the *Synod*, which ſeconded him, in the *Arian* *Arabians* of that Age. So far it was from the ſenſe of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, for which I am here concerned. I mention rather the ſenſe of the *Church* then being than that of *Origen*, that none may think this *Cenſure* imputable to any *ſingular Opinion* of *Origen*. The *Synod* convened on that Occaſion, ſhews plainly, that they did not look on that *Doctrin*e as diſputable, or of *little Importance*, but as *contrary* to thoſe *Traditions* wherein the *Catholick Church* was then agreed.

Euf. H. E.
vi. 37.

But

But the *perpetuating* of a *Nature* which was not of it *self* perpetual, and the *perpetuating* it with this very *Design* that they who had *not* of themselves a *Perpetuity* of *Being*, might notwithstanding be made capable of a *Perpetuity* of *Punishment*, is so great a *hardship* on the *Creature*, as that *God* did not think it becoming him to inflict it *arbitrarily*, nor agreeable to his other *Attributes* of *Goodness* and *Mercy*. He therefore took care not to do it but for a *Crime* of a *high* *Nature*, nor till they, who were concerned, had been fairly *warned* of the *Crime* by a sufficient *Promulgation* of his *Pleasure* concerning it. The *Judge* of *all the Earth* could do no otherwise than *Right*, as *Abraham* pleads with him; and *Right* according to those very *Opinions* which *himself* had settled among *Men* for their good *Government*, that he might be *justified* in his *Saying*, and *clear* whenever his *Case* should be *judged* by any *equal Expostulation*. This required that the *Criminals* should be left *destitute* of any *just Apology* for themselves, as the *Apostle* reasons. But it is allowed as an *equal Plea* in all *just* *Judicatories*, if the *Crime* charged were not in the *Power* of the *Criminal*, or if he had no antecedent *warning* for *avoiding* it. Accordingly he took care that *neither* of these *Pleas* should be *truly* *allegeable* by those whose *duration* should be *perpetuated* for

5. This perpetuating of Human Nature for Punishment could not be justly inflicted, till a Publication of God's pleasure that he judged the Devil a Publick Enemy; and that all who did not joyn the Body instituted by himself, should be taken for Associates of the Devil, and punished accordingly.

for this *end*, that they might thereby be made capable of *Punishments* otherwise exceeding the *natural* Powers of their degree of *Being*. The *Devil* himself was a *Subject* and enjoyed a *subordinate* Power under his *Creator*, and whatever *Jurisdiction* he had he could have no *otherwise* but by the *Grant* of *God* himself. And therefore *Communication* with *him* could be no otherwise *culpable* than as it is accounted with *ill affected* *Subjects*, before their *Hostilities* are *notorious* in *themselves*, or *notified* by publick *Proclamations*. Then, and not *till* then *joyning* with *them* becomes *Criminal*, and renders the *Persons* *joyning* with *them*, guilty of the same *Rebellion*, and liable to the same *Punishment* with the *principal* *Rebels*. Thus therefore *joyning* with the *Devil*, after he was a *proclaimed* *Rebel*, made those who did so of his *Party*, and, by becoming so, liable to the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Associates*, from that time *forward*, though it was not so *before*. Till such a publick *Notification* it is no more *Treasonable* to maintain a *civil* *Conversation* with *Traitors* than with other *Subjects*. And the *subordinate* Power allowed the *Devil* by *God*, supposed *him* also a *Subject*, and a *Member* of that great *Society* of which *God* is the *Head*, as well as the good *Angels*. This *Proclamation* therefore of the *Devil* as a publick *Enemy*, is peculiarly the
Office

Office of the *Gospel*: Especially as relating to the Affairs of *Souls*. Nor can any such thing be pretended, that I know of, from any Passages of the *Old Testament*, but only such as relate to the State of the *Gospel*. But it is the main Office of the *Gospel* it self, to proclaim the Devil a *Publick Enemy* to the *Kingdom of Heaven* preached by it, to denounce *War* against him, and to oblige all true *Subjects* of that *Kingdom* to joyn in the *War* against him, and to forbear, from thence forward, all *Communication* with him, under pain of sharing in his *Punishment*. That is, in that lower *Hell*, which was not originally designed for *Men*, but for him, and such as should willingly partake in his *Rebellion*. Under this Dispensation it is that our Blessed Lord has set up his *Standard*, his σταυρον, as the Prophet *Isaiah* calls it, like the *Arrier Bands*, still in use in several Countries, in Case of extreme danger, summoning every *Individual Subject* to repair to it, and threatening to treat them as *Enemies* themselves if afterwards they countenance the *Hostile Body* against which the *War* is proclaimed. This leaves no place for *Neutrality*, reckoning those as *Enemies* who do not list themselves in the *Prince's Service*, though they should not openly list themselves with his *Adversaries*, and making them liable to the *Punishment* intended for professed *Enemies*.

Enemies. Which is the very Case described in the Scriptures, of allotting them to the *Tartarean Fire* prepare for the *Devil* and *his Angels*. Nor does our *Saviour* allow of any *Neutrality*. So he warns us very plainly that *he* also will judge in our present Case. *He that is not with me, is against me : and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.* S. Matth. xii. 30. S. Luk. xi. 23. And all the Solemnities of *initiating* us into this *Spiritual Warfare* are proper to the Gospel. The *Cross* of *Christ* is indeed the *Military Standard* prophesied in the Old Testament concerning our new Dispensation in the *latter days* wherein we live. And so it was understood by our *Christian Ancestors*. The *New Testament* calls our Profession a *σπαρέιζ*, and makes our Warfare against *Spiritual Wickednesses in Heavenly Places*, and ascribes their *Ejection* out of *Heaven* to the good Success of this War against them. And the *Shield* of *Faith* is to quench the *fiery darts* of the *Devil*. And the *Triumph* over the *Devil* and his Party is in the *Cross*. So in our *Ecclesiastical Rites* of *Initiation*, our *Military Symbol* or *Word* (to use the Phrase of our modern *Tacticks*) is the *Creed*; our *Military Oath* is in our *Christian Sacraments*; the *Forms* of *συμβάσας τῷ χεῖρ* and *ἀντάσας τὸ Σατανᾶ*, are *allow* plainly *Military*, and our *Renunciations* are expressly against the *Devil*; and of the

World

World, and the *Flesh* no otherwise than as
 they help the *Devil* to *Objects* and *Disposi-*
tions, and *seasonable Opportunities* for en-
 snaring us. He therefore *alone* is the *Lord*
 and *Tyrant* of those *unhappy Souls* which lose
 their *Liberty* by being *conquered*, and, by
 the *Right of War*, become his *Slaves*. All
 these things are properly *New Testament*
Revelations, and therefore cannot affect
 those, who never *heard* of those *Revelations*,
 so as to involve them in *Punishments* dis-
 proportionable to their *Nature*, and which
 were not *originally* designed for *Men* at all,
 but *Devils*: nor for *Men* even *now* any
 otherwise than as by *not* joyning *Christ*, he
 himself has declared that he will so *inter-*
 pret it as if they had *joyned* themselves to
 the *Devil*. Thus they are supposed to en-
 title themselves to the *Punishment* of the
Heavenly Devils, by making their *Cause* the *same* with
 that of the *Devils*. Yet even these things
 also, which, in this way of Reasoning,
 make *wicked Men* liable to these *Eternal Pu-*
nishments are not *Revelations* of the *Old*
Testament, but of the *New*. It is our *Blessed*
Lord that has assured us, that the *Prince of*
this World is *judged*, S. *Joh.* xvi. 11. It is
Jude that teaches us, That the *Angels*
 which kept not their *first estate*, but left their
allowance habitation, are reserved in everlasting
Chains under *darkness* unto the *judgment* of
 the *great day*, v. 6. It is S. *Peter*, from
 whom

whom we learn, that *God* has *delivered* them *into chains of darkneſs, to be reſerved until Judgment*, 2 Ep. ii. 4. The Book of *Enoch* indeed ſhews ſome received *Opinions* concerning theſe things, even in the *Apoſtolic* Age. But in vain ſhall we expect a diſtinct account from the *Old Teſtament* of the *Puniſhment* of fallen *Angels* when there is ſo little mention of their *Fall*. Their *Fall* is indeed ſuppoſed, and, perhaps, allude to in ſome *Propheſies* of the *Old Teſtament*. But no particular of this Sentence againſt them, nothing of their being *chained*, and that in *Chains of Darkneſs*. Nothing of their being *reſerved* for *Judgment*, or of the day appointed for their *Judgment*. Theſe were indeed *Conjectures* taken up by the *Helleniſts*, perhaps from ſome *footſteps* of *Primitive Tradition*. But they never had the Authority of *Divine Revelation* (which was that alone that could *aſſure* us of *Faith* of this Nature) till the times of the *New Teſtament*. Theſe are they alone which aſſure us, that they are then deſigned for that lower *Adſs*, which was known among the *Heathens* by the name of *Tartarus*. How then could *Men* be warned that they ſhould be reckoned as of the *Devil's Party* whiſt the *Devil* was not yet declared as the *Head* of a *Party*? How could they be threatned with the *Puniſhment*, which do no otherwiſe belong to them than as the

A PRÆMONITION. xxxiii

were of *that Party*, whilst there were yet
no clear and distinct *Revelations* concern-
ing the *nature* of those *Punishments* which
were impossible to be *known* otherwise than
by *Divine Revelation*? If this Title of
Men, to *Preternatural* and *Eternal Punish-*
ments must commence from the *time* where-
in the *Devil* was *proclaimed* a *publick Enemy*:
This Supposition puts it in the *Arbitrary*
Power of *God* when they should commence,
because it was perfectly *Arbitrary* to
him, when he would be pleased to *no-*
tify his *Pleasure* in this matter, and to
proclaim the *Devil* a *publick Enemy*. And
their being *Arbitrary* will make them
most agreeable to the *nature* of the *Re-*
wards, by which our *new Legislation* re-
ceives its *Sanction*, which being *Preter-*
natural and *Supernatural*, can be no other
than *Arbitrary*. If therefore this *noti-*
fication began with the *Gospel*, the *Pu-*
nishment must begin so too. Yet the
Hypothesis of *Preaching* and *Baptizing*
in *Advs*, as an *Ordinary Means* for sa-
ving them who lived *before* the *Publi-*
cation of the *Gospel*, will easily make
them liable to the same *Punishment* at
the *last Day*, who never heard of the
Gospel, whilst they were in their *Bo-*
dy, if *God* be *pleased* to make them con-
cerned in it.

b

But

6. The Publication of the Devil as an open Enemy, began from the beginning of the Gospel.

But I did not derive this *Publication* of *God's Pleasure* in this matter *high enough* when I traced no *earlier Footsteps* of it than from the time of *St. Paul's Sermon* to the *Athenians*. I now take the true *Original Promulgation* of this new *Law*, to have been from those *Words* of our *Saviour*, *joining the Promulgation* of his *Gospel* *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* So *St. Mark* xvi. 15, 16. who is so far from being an *Epitomator* of *St. Matthew* (as some conceive him) that he is *fuller* than *St. Matthew* himself, or any other of the *Evangelists*, at least in this particular. This Word is *κηρυκεῖν*. That Word properly signifies the *condemnatory Sentence* given in a *κρίσις*, which indifferently denotes a Sentence of *Absolution*, as well as of *Condemnation*, *Rom. ii. 1.* This is the *κρίσις* of the *κρίσις*, *1 Cor. xi. 32.* As the *World* signifies the *opposite Body* to that of *Christ*, that is, that *Body* of which the *Devil* is the *Head*, and the *God*, and the *Prince* in the *Stile* of the *New Testament*. It is the same with the *κρίσις* elsewhere, which also generally signifies the *worst* Sense. It is stiled *κρίσις αἰώνιον*, *Ebr. vi. 2.* And *καὶ ματὲς Διαβόλου*, *1 Tim. iii. 6.* to shew that it is a Sentence to an *Eternal Punishment*.

like that which was passed on the *Devil*,
 which *wicked Men* make themselves ob-
 noxious, by their *not* siding with our com-
 mon Lord, when required to do so. So
 the *Christian* explains it, that it is their *Society*
 with the *Devils* that makes them liable to
 the *Punishment of Devils*. *Κρίσις* also, tho'
 otherwise (as I said) of a *middle* Significa-
 tion, yet, in the *New Testament*, it is al-
 most appropriated to the *harsher* Sense. So
 the coming *εἰς κρίσιν* is opposed to *having Ever-*
lasting Life, which is taken for the same as
passing from Death to Life, St. John v. 24.
κρίσις thus understood, must be the same
 with the *κατάκρισις* denounced by our Savi-
 our against the *Unbelievers* of the Gospel.
 This therefore can be no other but the *κρί-*
σις τῆς Διαβολῆς mentioned by the Aposto-
 le Ignatius, in his famous *Epistle* to the
Romans. That *Punishment* which is to be
 inflicted on the *Devil* by the *Λόγος*, the
χρῆσις in the *ἡμέτερον κρίσις* designed for the
Devil, according to the Opinion of the
Jellensists, confirmed by the *Revelations*
 of the *New Testament*. That very *κρίσις*
 which is opposed by the *Apostle* to a simple
Itala, Rom. ii. 12. and which is there
 opposed to a *νόμος*, like that by which we
 are sentenced to *Death* in *Adam*. And
 thus it appears, that they are reckoned as of
 the *Devils Party*, who are to be punished
 that very *Punishment* which was origi-
 nally

nally designed for none but Devils. this *ἁγίως* belongs to all that do not receive the Gospel, when it is sufficiently proposed to them. So the Evangelist; *Ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐκάλει τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅτι οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἠγάπησαν τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς, ὅτι οἱ ἔργα αὐτῶν κακά.* St. John 19. By disbelieving the Gospel, they disbelieve the Society of Christ, who is by him said to be the Light that enlightneth every one that cometh into the World. And by continuing in their Original Darknefs when they might have Light, they are interpreted to chuse that Darknefs rather than the Light refused by them, and consequently to chuse the Party, who is the Prince of Darknefs. This is said to be the cause that makes them liable to this *ἁγίως*, which belongs to them as the Associates of the Devil, that they do not receive the Gospel when sufficiently proposed to them. This is the Meaning of the Opposition between Light and Darknefs in the first Catholick Epistle of St. John, and of the ways of Light and Darknefs in the second Catholick Epistle of St. Barnabas. They thereby shew, that the Gospel, since its Publication, admits of no Neutrality; but that whoever does not embrace the Gospel, for that Reason, be judged to chuse the Party of the Prince of Darknefs; and therefore be adjudged to that outer Tartarous Darknefs where he is chained, and part

A PRÆMONITION. xxxvii

of that Judgment of the great Day, for which he is reserved in those Chains. This therefore is the Meaning of the Damnation denounced by our Saviour against Disbelievers of his Gospel. And this Authority St. Paul had for letting the Athenians know the Terms on which they were obliged to receive the Gospel. And this was the Rule for all the other Apostles also in their Preachings, to oblige their Auditors to receive their Doctrine, and to enter into their Communion. They never allow any middle State in their Auditors between Light and Darkness, between Christ and Belial, between the Table of the Lord, and the Table of Devils; between Everlasting Salvation, and the Everlasting Damnation to the Fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels. And they always reckon them in the State of preternatural Misery, till they might be prevailed on to qualifie themselves for Supernatural Happiness, by joining in External Communion with themselves, as being alone authorized to receive them to the Mystical and Invisible Communion with the Father and the Son.

Here therefore began this Obligation, as 7. It is supposed in the Preaching of our Bl. Saviour, and of S. John the Baptist. concerned all Men, and every where, as the Apostle expresses it, in his Sermon to the Athenians; that is, as it concerned all Nations, as well as that of the Jews, and all Countries as well as Palestine. This

xxxviii A PRÆMONITION.

Extent of it *began* from this *Command* (the
our *Saviour* to his *Apostles*, immediate *Sp*
before his *Departure* from them. At lea *and*
from the *time* that they were *convinced* *be,*
the *Right* of other *Nations* to be *received* *Pun*
to the *new Peculium*; and of their own *D* *Ang*
ty to *Preach* to them, and to *invite* and *Pre*
ceive them into their *privileged Body*. *Year*
even *before* all *Nations* were thought *co* *Pre*
cerned in it, they who *heard* of the *G* *eve*
pel, either from our *Saviour* himself in *Pe* *on*
son, or from *St. John* the *Baptist*, are repr *Do*
sented as lying under the same *Obligati* *the*
to receive it under the like *Penalty* of the *of*
Eternal Fire which was *prepared* for the *be*
Devil and his *Angels*, in case they failed *7-*
doing so. The *Fire* threatned by *or* *Ph*
Lord himself to his own *Auditors*, is the *xxi*
ἔνεα πύργους, *St. Matth.* v. 22. xviii. 9. *S*
Mark ix. 43, 45. alluding to that of the *wh*
Valley of *Hinnom*, which is generally *his*
derstood of the *Tartarean Fire*. And the *wh*
it is not misunderstood when it is thought *Col*
so, appears from the *Epithets* ascribed *the*
it, of its being *unextinguishable* and *etern* *an*
St. Mark ix. 43, 44, 45, 46, 48. And the *Wr*
same is implied in the *Worm* that is joined *Th*
with it, that is said *never* to *die*. The *Wr*
would add no new *Degree* of *Terror* to the *his*
Criminals, that the *Fire*, or the *Worm*, were *fi*
Eternal, if themselves might hope *not* to *ry*
so. Plainly therefore the *Punishment* her *vio*
threat

threatned, is such as belongs to *Immortal Spirits*, such as the *Devils* themselves are, and such as *they* also must be supposed to be, who are to be *qualified* for suffering the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. Nor did this *begin* with the *Preaching* of our *Blessed Lord* himself. The *Yearliest* *Epocha* of the *Gospel*, is from the *Preaching* of *St. John the Baptist*. Yet even he also supposes the same *Obligation* on his *Auditors*, to join with him in his *Doctrine* and *Baptism*, which were both of them preparatory to the *Doctrine* and *Baptism* of our *Saviour*. He warns them of the *μελλουσα*, *St. Matth. iii. 7. St. Luke iii. 7.* The same Phrase is elsewhere paraphrased by the *αἰσιν τῆς γένησιν*, *St. Matth. xxiii. 33.* which plainly makes them liable to the *condemnatory Sentence* of the *Judgment* which is to be passed against the *Devil* and his *Associates*. This is the *Wrath* of *God* which abides on the *Disobedient*, *Eph. v. 6. Col. iii. 6.* that is for them who obey not the *Gospel*, in the *Epistle* to the *Thessalonians*. The *Wrath* prepared for the *Vessels of Wrath*, fitted for *Destruction*, *Rom. ix. 22.* The *Wrath* of the *Lamb*, the great day of his *Wrath*, *Rev. vi. 16, 17.* The *Wine-press* of his *Wrath*, *Rev. xiv. 19. xix. 15.* in allusion to the like Phrase in *Isaiah*. That *very Wrath* to come, from which it is our *Saviour's* Office to deliver us, *1 Thess. i. 10.*

This can be no other but the *Wrath* designed for the *Devils*, who are the proper *Sons* and *Vessels* of *Wrath*, which *Men* are no otherwise entitled to, than as they are of his *Party*. He warns them also of the usual Fate of *unprofitable Trees*, whose end is to be *cut down* and *cast into the fire*, St. *Matth.* iii. 10. This is a Similitude elsewhere used by our *Saviour* himself, St. *Matth.* vii. 19. 1 *John* xv. 6. It is taken from the Notions of the *Rustick Writers* that when a *Tree* is *twice dead*, that is, for *two years* together has born nothing, it is then to be judged as past *hopes* of Recovery to its vegetative Life, and is therefore to be *cut down*, as *cumbring the Ground*, as being thenceforward no otherwise useful than for the *Hearth* on which it is to be *burned*. That is really the case of the *Vine* especially, which is most frequently compared with the State of our *Christian Life*, whose *Wood* is otherwise unuseful, and has nothing else to recommend it to the Care of *Men* besides its *Fruitfulness*. This is alluded to by our *Saviour* in his Parable And by St. *Jude* in his ἀκαρπα, δις ἀποθνήσκοντα, ἐκελωθέντα, v. 12. ἔτις ὁ ζῶν 18 σήμερος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τελήρηται, v. 13. This is plainly the σκόλον ἐξώτερον, as described also most in the same Words, in 2 *Pet.* ii. 17. It is also joined with *Fire*, So 2 *S. Pet.* iii. 7. τηρέμενοι πυρὶ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως ἢ ἀπωλείας

τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων. What can this be
 but that very *Darkness*, and that very *Fire*,
 which were *prepared* for the *Devil* and his
Angels? These *ungodly Men* therefore must
 be such as have made themselves *Partakers*
 of his *Punishment*, by *joining* themselves to
 him in his *Rebellion*. Thus it appears,
 that from the very *beginning* of the *Pub-*
lication of the *Gospel*, the *Devil* has been
 proclaimed as a *publick Enemy* of the
Souls of Men; and as a *Head* of all *Re-*
bellion, who should make all *Human*
Souls also liable to those *Punishments*
 (which were indeed fitted to the *Nature*
 of *Devils*, though *preternatural* to
Men) who should *not join* with *Christ*,
 in *Opposition* to him, upon the *Summons*
 of the *Gospel*. But there is nothing of
 this in the *Old Testament*. The *Devil* is
 there represented as *envious* of the *Pro-*
spérité of Mankind, and an *Accuser*, and
 a *Suggester* of pernicious *Counsels*. But
 without any mention of any *Design* far-
 ther than *Temporals*. There he robbed
Adam, and, by *Consequence*, his *Posterity*,
 of the *Temporal Felicities* of the *Visible*
Paradise. There he tempts *Job* to *Im-*
patience and *Murmuring* against the *Di-*
vine Providence, by the *Temporal Calami-*
ties which *God* permitted him to inflict
 upon him. There he brought a *Plague*
 on the whole *Body of Israel*, by tempting
 David

David to an ostentatious numbering of them. There he drew *Abab* into a War with the *Syrians*, which proved fatal to him, by being a *Lying Spirit*, prophesying Success in the Mouth of those *Prophets* who had otherwise been used to *Truer Inspirations*. There he opposes the *High-Priesthood* of *Joshua* the Son of *Josedek*, by performing his Office of a *Slanderer* and *False Accuser*. But we can find nothing there concerning any Power allowing him for drawing *Human Souls* into a *Participation* of his *Punishment* in their *Separate State*.

8.

The Rab-
bins per-
fectly igno-
rant of any
Divine
Tradition
concerning
the Natu-
ral Im-
mortality
of Hu-
mane
Souls in
general.

If I had thought *Rabbinical Testimo-*
nies satisfactory for proving *Opinions* re-
ceived among the *Jews* of the *Apostolical*
Age; more might have been said from
them for disproving the *Tradition* of the
Doctrine of the *Natural Immortality* of
Humane Souls. It is a Maxim with them,
that all *Israelites*, and none but *Israelites*,
are to have a Portion in the *Future Age*
under the *Messias*. This may indeed be
understood of the *Immortal Happiness* of
that *Age*, which they appropriate to their
own *Nation* and the *Proselytes* incorporated
into it, who can alone plead an *Interest* in
their *Messias*, as being of the same *Extraction*
with him. But this would again have per-
plexed them, in giving an Account of the
State of *Heathen Souls*, if the *Doctrine* of the

the *Natural Immortality* of all *Humane*, even *Heathen*, *Souls* had been received by them as an *Original Divine Tradition* from their *Ancestors*. For this *Doctrine* would *exclude* them from *Eternal Happiness*. And *Eternal Misery* is too great an *Evil* to be inflicted on them by *Divine Goodness* arbitrarily. And their being of another *Nation*, could not alone be *Merit* sufficient for it. It was neither their *Crime*, nor was it their own *Choice*, but *Divine Providence*, that made them so. Nor can there be any *Third* *Eternal State* suitable to the *Nature* of a *Rational Soul*; neither *happy*, nor *miserable*, as there must be, if those *Souls* be *naturally Immortal*. I might mention those who interpret the Passage of *Psal. i.* that the *Sinners shall not stand in the Judgment*, of their *perishing* for ever. So the Famous *R. David Kimchi*. I might also mention those, who understand the *slinging* the *Souls* of the *Wicked* as out of a *Sling* of *Annihilation*, because it is opposed to *binding* in the *Bundle of Life*. *I Sam. xxv.* I might mention other *Rabbinical Authorities*, which make the *Deluge* and the *Fire of Sodom* *Specimens* of *Hell*; (*δαιμον* is the Word in *St. Jude* concerning *Sodom*) and therefore *excuses* them from those *future Eternal Pains* of the *Day of Judgment*, by an *Annihilation*; as being *discharged* from the *real Punishment*, as having born it in *Effigie*.

Ac-

Accordingly they thought that those *Antediluvians* and the *Sodomites* were neither to *rise again*, nor to be *presented* before the Divine Tribunal at the *General Judgment*. As if they *believed* the *Souls* of those *Delinquents* *extinguished* immediately on the *Dissolution* of their *Bodies*. So the Excellent *Dr. Windet*, §. 9. This *Observation* of those *Rabbins* is directly *contrary* to that of *Dr. Hammond*, who thinks them *actually* punished with *Eternal Torments*, for the very *same* Reason; but otherwise interpreted, because they were *δέρμα αἰώνιος πύλος*. But that is none of my Concern at present. The Use I make of these *Observations* now is only to shew, that our *present Rabbins* know of no *Tradition* derived from their *Ancestors* concerning the *Natural Immortality* of *Human Souls*. For by the same Reason for which they believe *some* *Human Souls* *actually* *Mortal*, they *must* believe all *naturally* so, if they believe our *Human Generation* *Univocal*, and that *Human Souls* are all of the same *Nature*. The *Divine* Attribute of *Goodness* will more easily allow of an *Arbitrary Advancement*, than of an *Arbitrary Debasing*, of what *God* himself has been pleased to make an *Ingredient* in our *Natural Constitution*. The *innocentest* way therefore of making them *actually* *Die*, is rather to leave such *Souls* to the *Consequences* of their own *Nature*, unassisted by

extra

extraordinary and therefore *undue*, Divine Influences; than *directly* to *destroy*, or to *deny* them *arbitrarily* any thing *necessary* to their *Subsistence*, by the *Exigency* of their *Nature*; which *Exigency* alio is occasioned by a *Law* made by himself. But, I confess, I have not that Opinion of *Rabbinical Traditions*, as to take them for competent Proofs of the *Opinions* of their *Ancestors* of the *Apostles* Age; without better corroborating Proof, that such *Opinions* were *then* received. I have therefore chosen to insist on such *Testimonies* as were, in my Opinion, more *conclusive*; that is, of those who *lived* in that *Age* themselves.

I have withal here shewn, that this *Divine Spirit* cannot *now* be received from any but *Bishops*, as *Successors* to the *Apostles* in all the *highest Acts* of their *Ordinary Authority*; which was *not* to fail upon the extinction of the *Persons* of the *Apostles*, as grounded on those *Extraordinary Gifts* and *Rights* which were only *Personal*, and were *extinguished* with their *Persons*. But much more so, as they are *Successors* of our *Lord* himself in that very *Prerogative* wherein he was *above* all the other *Apostles*, either *singly* understood; or *collectively*, as He was the *Visible Head* of the *Mystical Union* of the *Spirit*; so that none of *them* could have the *Divine Spirit*, unless they

g.
The Right here insisted on of the Bishops alone for conferring the Spirit, destroys all Right to the Mystical Heavenly Communion in them who are divided from their respective Bishops.

they received it from *him*. Nor could they continue it any longer than they continued *their Communication with him*, any more than a *broken Branch of a Vine* can continue its *Vegetative Life* any longer than it continues its *Incorporation in the Vine* for deriving those *present and perpetual Influences* which are as necessary for continuing this *Vegetative Life*, as deriving it at first. Nor any more than a *Member of our Animal Bodies* can continue its *Animal Life* without *Communion with the Head*; from which all the *Body*, by *Joints and Bandages* having *Nourishment* ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God, Col. ii. 19. These are *Scripture-Examples*, explaining the necessary dependence of the *Members of the Mystical Body* on their *Head*, in order to their *Participation of this Divine and Immortal Life*, to which we are entitled by the *Spirit*. And this Reasoning is used in these *Sacred Writings*, with a particular regard to the *Visible Body of the Church in this World*, to convince its *Members* of their unavoidable *Duty*, to continue in its *External Visible Communion*, and in *Subjection to its Visible Head*, if they will continue their *Right to the Invisible Communion of the Spirit*, and their *Mystical influences* from the *Father and the Son*, as *Head of that Mystical Communion*, as transacting all their *Covenanting Commerce* with us

they *this Life*, no otherwise than by the *Visible*
Heads deriving *Authority* from them, to
 more *represent* and *conclude* them. So St. John
Reasons in his *first Catholick Epistle*, for
 n *proving* a *κωνωλία* with *himself* and his
 for *Fellow Apostles* necessary in order to the
Maintaining the *Mystical Invisible κωνωλία*
with the Father and the Son. St. Cyprian
 it *makes* it as impossible to *continue* the *Vital*
Spiritual Influences in *Members* separate from
Life the *Visible Body*, and *rebell*ing against its
 from *Visible Head*, as it is to *continue* a *stream*
 and upon an *interruption* of it from its *Fountain*,
together a *Sun-beam* upon the *interposition* of an
*Col*opacous *Body* between it and the *Sun*. The
plain Reasoning holds still as long as the *World*,
Members and the *Church* in this *World*, lasts. For
 n or the *Covenant* is still the *same* to *oblige* the
living Church in *Heaven* by *Acts* of the *Church* on
 e *Earth*; and to *oblige* all the *Members* of
 ing the *Church* in *Earth* to their *Duty* to their
 par *Earthly Superiours* in affairs of this *Nature*,
 the *under Pain*, if they *violate* that *Duty*, of
Members *overthrowing* all their *pretensions* to *Benefits*
to be ratified in *Heaven*. The *Body* of the
 nd in *Church* now, is as much the *same* with what
 y will was in the *Apostles Age*, as it is possible
to be in a *Body* consisting of *Mortal Indi*-
viduals. And therefore the *Government* is
Head the *same* suitably to the *Nature* of the *Body*,
*act*ing the *same Apostolical Power* conveyed down-
 us *wards* through a *succession* of *Mortal Men*,
 such

such as the *Apostles* themselves were. And therefore if a *Rebellion* against them *the* was a *Rebellion* against the *Father* and the *Son*, it must be so *still*, and leave the *Rebels* destitute of all the invaluable *Benefits* of *Mystical Communion*. And the *Reason* I have here insisted on, proves it be so *à Priori*. The *Mystical Communion* the *Communion* of the *Spirit*, by which we communicate with the *Father*, as the *Spirit* is his *Seed*, and as our participation of the *Spirit* does entitle us to be his *Sons*, in a higher and a more peculiar way than the *ἔκγονον* or *Flatus* does, which is common to *Mankind*, though *that* also does in a lower way entitle all who have it to be his *Children*. However, as this *κοινωνία* makes us of one *Civitas* or *Patria* with the *Father*, so it is the peculiar *Prerogative* of the higher and *Diviner Spirit*. For this also qualifies us for ascending to *Heaven* properly so called, which the *Scripture* represents as the peculiar *Residence* of the *Father*, to which it is the *Sons* Office to bring us when he finishes his *Mediatorial Office*, and delivers up his *Government* to the *Father*. That is the time for bringing the many *Sons* unto glory. By it we also communicate with the *Son* as having the *Fulness* of the *Spirit* from whom we must derive our share of our *Grace for Grace*, according to the measure he is pleased to allot us, respectively.

If therefore *this* be derivable only from the
Bishop, how can we expect any of the Be-
 nefits of the *Cælestial Communion*, but by
Visible Communion with the *Bishop*? And
 that this was the Opinion of those who
 lived in that *part* of the *Apostles* Age, where-
 in the *Ordinary Government* of the *Church*
 was settled (who could not possibly be igno-
 rant what *Rights* were designed for that Sa-
 cred Order) appears from hence, that the
Bishop, and he alone, was then taken for
 the *Authorized Representative* of *God* and
Christ, as I have shewn in my *Parænesis*,
 from the best *Witness* now extant of those
 Times, the *Apostolical Ignatius*. I am sure,
 a far more competent *Witness* than the
Glosses and *Reasonings* of *Blondel*, and his
Party, from *Negative Testimonies*, before any
Ordinary Government was settled. From
 hence it appears that the *Bishop* alone could
 oblige *God* and *Christ* to give the *Spirit*,
 because he only was their *Authorized Repre-*
sentative, who had it in their *Power* to give
 it. The rather so, because he represented
 them, not by any thing that was *Common*
 to him with *Ordinary Presbyters*, but by what
 was peculiar to him on account of his *Right*
 to the first *Chair*. He, and he alone, who
 was the *Head* of the *Presbytery* could re-
 present them as *Subordinate Heads* of the
Mystical Unity. He, and he alone, could
 represent them as a *Principle* of *Unity*, who

could oblige the whole Church to be, and continue, one Body, by obliging them all to acquiesce in the determinations of a single Person, who could not otherwise divide the Body, than by being divided from himself. Nor could he more effectually maintain the Unity of the Spirit, than by having this Ministerial distribution of the Spirit appropriated to his Office, as our Blessed Saviour had the distribution of the particular Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, by being himself the Fulness of this Divine Seed of the Spirit, from whom all others were to receive it, if they would pretend to any good Title to it. Thus then the Reasoning would proceed, that all Pretenders to the Spirit who had not received it from the Bishop could not have that Divine Spirit, which was the Bond of Mystical Ecclesiastical Unity, and therefore could have no other but the ill Spirit, since our Lord had taken away all pretences for Neutrality, by declaring them all publick Enemies, who were joined with himself; and by declaring the Despisers of himself, who despised his Authorized Vicegerents. Nor has Blondel produced one single Instance, of the Baptism of the Spirit's being administred by any ordinary Presbyter before the IVth Century, nor even then any allowed Instance that it was ever so administred but by the Bishop. It is strange that he should

A PRÆMONITION.

li

make the *prohibitory Canons* an Argument that this liberty of giving the *Baptismal Spirit* was the *Right of common Presbyters* Originally, when he could not find any Example that *Ordinary Presbyters* did pretend to give it before the now-mentioned Century, either with, or without, the *Bishops leave*. All he could infer from thence, could only be, that some *private Presbyter* had pretended to this Power before the *Canons* which prohibited them. But that they did it, as claiming an *Original Right* to do it, he has not, he could not prove. The contrary appears, that none but *Bishops* were thought to have a *Right* to give the *Spirit*, by Testimonies much elder than those *Canons*. It is supposed on both sides in the older Disputes concerning the *Validity of Baptisms* by *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*. However they differed concerning the *Validity of Baptisms* of opposite *Communities*, yet they either of them believed the *Spirit* given by the Church, nor without the *Imposition of Hands* of a *Catholick Bishop*. And this is notorious in the allowed *Practice* of the Church, that none but *Bishops* were owned to have the *Right of Admitting to Communion*, or excluding from it, which was a natural Consequence from this *Right* of their giving the *Spirit*, or withdrawing it, by which this *communion* was to be maintained, as being indeed no other than the

ἡτοιμασθαι τὸν λαόν. Accordingly the
Bishops own none other for their *Collegues* but
 their *Fellow Bishops*. None had the Right
 of giving or receiving *Communicatory Letters*
 as addressed to them but *Bishops*. Not
 even the *Presbyters* in a *full See*, any other
 wise than by the *Bishops Orders* or *Pro-
 mission*. If they did otherwise, they were
 counted *Rebels*, as well as other *Affronters*
 of the *common Authority* of the *Society*. Nor
 others had a *Right* of *subscribing* *Definitions*
 to their *Synodical Canons*, as being the
 alone who could *undertake* for their
respective Bodies. They, as *immediately*
 presenting *God* and *Christ* were, on that
 account, believed *Supreme* and *Unappellable*,
 within their own *respective Dioceses*
 in particulars belonging properly to the
Spiritual Jurisdiction. And it is counted
 as *absurd* to judge of such a *Cause* deter-
 mined by the *Bishop*, as to judge of the
 will of *God* and *Christ*, from whom they were believed
 to have received such an *unaccountable* *Autho-
 rity*. So *St. Cyprian*, and the other
Bishops of his *Age*, among whom a *Catholic*
Correspondence was maintained on this *Prin-
 ciple*. So the *Apocalyptick Angels*, who were
commended for all the *Good*, and charged
 with all the *Blame*, of their *respective*
Jurisdictions. Which could not have been
 if they had been *controulable* by a *Majority*
 of *Suffrages* of their several *Presbyters*.

A PRÆMONITION.

liiii

They governed indeed by the *Counsel* of their *Presbyters*, but were no more determined by the *Majority* of their *Suffrages*, than our *Princes* are by the *Suffrages* of their *Councils*, though their *Edicts* run in that *Form*, as if they had been issued by their *Advice* and *Authority*. That very Learned Man, in his most elaborate Collection, has not produced any single *Instance* of any thing referred to the *Suffrages* of the *Presbyteries*. So far he is from any thing that was carried in them against the persevering Sense of the *Bishop*. So far is this *Moderatorship* of a *Chair-man* from the true Power of *Primitive*, *Catholick*, *Apostolick*, *Episcopon* *pacy*.

This Argument I have insisted on, with a particular Regard to the Case of those *Enthusiasts* mentioned in the Letter now transcribed. But it fits the Case of *Separatists* from *Episcopal* Communion, of what Denomination soever, as well as that of the *Enthusiasts*. None of them can expect the *Benefits* of any *privileged Society*, if they will not submit to the *Laws* and *Governours* of it. No, not unless they will submit to the *Governours* of it in *this World*, if God be pleased to incorporate it into a *Society*, even in *this World* also. None of them can expect to be treated otherwise than as *Enemies*, and as *Fellow-Rebels* with the *Devil*, when God has notified his *Resolution*

IO.
This dependence on Episcopacy, for receiving the Spirit, concerns the case of all Separatists from Episcopacy, as well as Enthusiasts.

lution to *treat* them as *Enemies*, and *Subjects* and *Soldiers* of the *Devil*, who *wanting* to themselves in *not joining* themselves to the *Body* of his own *Subjects* and *Favourites*, and to those *Governours* of *Churches* who derive that same *Authority*, as it is *capable* of being derived by *Mortals* at a *distance*, by a *Succession* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, when they also were *visible* here on *Earth*. What can they pretend in this *Reasoning* incongruous to the *Nature* of *priviledged Societies* in general, or to the *particular Nature* of our *Christian Societies* as settled by *Christ* and his *Apostles*? If they can shew nothing so, methinks they should not *venture* to censure *Ignatius* as *mad* and *blasphemous*, for declaring them *Servants* of the *Devil*, who *then* separated from *Episcopal Communion*. They may easily understand how much better he might know *Facts*, and *Doctrines* too, of the *Apostles* in their *latter times*, than *themselves* can now who have *not* one even *Canonical History* of those *latter times*. They know with how impossible it was for *him* to have been transported by any *Prejudice* against their own *Innovations*, which it was impossible for him to *know* without a *Divine Revelation*; which, if he *had*, it must have all been as impossible for him to have been *mistaken* in his *Judgment* concerning them. But I have shewn it perfectly agreeable to

the Sense of *those times*, as far as we can trace it from our few remaining Monuments. I have shewn, that God himself has contrived the matter so, that none can have the *Mystical Communion* without the *Spirit*; nor the *Spirit* without a *Visible Communion* that is *Episcopal*. This I think I have already proved, in what I have said concerning the *Spirit*. I have endeavoured to prove it likewise concerning *Remission of Sins*, and the *Incorporation* into the *Mystical Body of Christ* in both the *Sacraments*, which make us *one Body*, as well as *one Spirit* with him, and all the other *Benefits* consequent to that *Incorporation*, in a short Discourse drawn up many Years ago, upon the Subject of *Sacerdotal Absolution*; which, upon this occasion, I thought fit to communicate to the Reader. The rather so, because it proceeds on the same Topick of the *Divine Contrivance* of the *Spiritual Society*. Which is certainly more cogent than our Adversary's Reasonings from *Scriptures* elder than the *Constitution* of *Government* in any other Church, besides that of *Jerusalem*.

How little are our *Dividers* aware of these *Consequences* wherein they are so deeply concerned? And withal, how impatient of having them fairly represented to them? They possess themselves with *Prejudices* against them to consider the Reasons here offered impartially.

II.

An applicatory Address to the Separatists, in treating

gainst us, and pretend us *immoderate* for the *Severity* of our *Conclusions*, and take this for an *Excuse* for not *examining* into the *Merit* of our *Cause*. This is the way to make their *Case desperate*, if our *Reasons* should prove indeed so *convincing*, and the *Danger* consequently so *great* as we believe it. And can they think us *immoderate* though we are not *indifferent* what becomes of their *Souls*, the *Purchase* of the *Blood* of our dearest *Lord*? Can they tell us how we can better express our *good Will* to them than by that *vehement Concern* for their *Good*, which they are pleased to expose under the *odious* Epithet of *Immoderation*? Can they find in their *Hearts* to be displeased at us, for venturing the *Effects* of their present *Prejudices* against us, rather than suffering them to persevere *unwarily* in those *Courses* which we believe of so irreparably *pernicious* *Consequence* to their most *important* *Interests* which ought to be dearest, as to *themselves*, so to all who *feignedly love* them? But how can they in earnest, *know* that we are *immoderate* without entering upon the *Consideration* of the *Merit* of the *Cause*? They must not interpret their *Notion* of *Moderation*, as to make its *Offices* inconsistent with the *Offices* of true *Zeal*, which are as unquestionably *obliging*, and as much *recommended* in *Scripture*, as the *Moderation* they so much pretend.

ate pretend to. And the best *Expedient*, I
 d know of, for judging when *severe* Censures
 into are to be judged *immoderate*, is to be taken
 way from the *Merit* of the *Cause*; when that is
Reason first impartially settled. If the *Cause* be ve-
 nd they *momentous*, and the *Evidence* great and
 belie certain, and the *Concern* no more than
 ate what is *suitable* to that *Momentousness* and
 mes *Evidence*; who can think the Censure *im-*
 mod moderate, or exceeding the *Bounds* of due
 us ho and just *Severity*, which is by all owned as
 o then *Virtue*, and to contain nothing that a
 r the *good Man* needs to be *ashamed* of? This
 oose plainly requires their having *examined* it
 eration before they can be admitted as competent
 be *Judges* of *Immoderation*. Till they have
 ffects done so, it is impossible for them to judge
 rathow far the *Temper* of the *Person* is ingre-
 nwarrant in the *asperity* of the *Censure*; because,
 f so ill then, it is impossible for them to know
 o thow far the *Censure* is *just* and *reasonable*.
 nt to ill then, they cannot judge for *themselves*.
 who how then can they have that *higher De-*
 an three of *Certainty*, which is requisite to qua-
 noderate them to judge of the Case of *others*,
 ation whether they be acted more by *Reason* or
 t not malignity of *Temper*. For this they must
 n, as we that *Evidence* as *themselves*, at least,
 ne *Officer* judge sufficient, *not* only to satisfy
 tional *themselves*, but all *others* also who are not
 d in *themselves* wanting to *themselves*. But I see
 so much reason why they should concern *Per-*
 preten sons

sons at all in Disputes of this Nature. far it is from being justifiable to pre-
 against *Reasons*, upon a *Presumption* of
will, in the Person who produces them.
 It is no Concern of *private* Persons
 judge at all of the good or ill meaning
 Persons not committed to our *Charity*
 where the Judgment is of no other use
pure Speculation. And *Hearts* of Men
 far more difficult to be judged of, than
 their *Arguments*. Why should they choose
 an *easier* for a more difficult Dispute?
 The Cause is that for which they must
 responsible to God and their own
sciences. And the *Arguments* are they
 which God will judge, whether they
 sufficient *Evidence* to oblige them to espouse
 that Cause. And these, as they are not
 stronger, so neither are they the weaker,
 the *Indifferency* or *Zeal* of the *Proposers*.
 Let them therefore secure themselves by
 solid and satisfactory *Answer* to our *Ar-
 guments*. And they will, at the same time
 perform a *charitable Office* to us, in clearing
 us of our hard *Opinions* of their *State*.
 they can prove our hard *Opinions* ground-
 less. Till they do so, they cannot ex-
 cite it: Nor can they believe that we
 them, or have that real *Concern* for *Souls*
 which becomes zealous *Honourers* of
 common Lord the *Lover* of *Souls*, if we
 believe them in great danger, yet not

re. warn them of it, nor be vehemently con-
 preje. cerned for them, while it is in their Power,
 n of upon warning, to avoid it. One would
 s th. think the *Greatness* of the *Danger* should be
 sons Recommendation of the *Love* that is
 ning shown in warning of it. So we use to
 Ch. judge in Cases of incomparably less Im-
 use portance. The good God, on whose Attri-
 Men bute our *Latitudinarians* so much depend,
 f, did not think it inconsistent with his
 y ch. goodness, to threaten these *Evils*, which
 Dispo. they judge so hardly of. No, nor to
 multi. terrify them, by such *Threats*, to make
 yn an Election of what is otherwise so ad-
 they antagious to them. Why then should they
 they misinterpret it as an Argument of *Ill will*
 to es. to them, that we urge, with all possible
 e not opportunity, the same well-designed *Terrors*
 aker, of the greatest and most sincere Promoter of
 opom. their greatest *Interests*? The urging them
 ves in no more contribute to the bringing
 ur A. upon them, than a wise *Physician's*
 me t. warning of an Ailing (most certainly Mor-
 in et if neglected, but as certainly curable in
 State. them who secure themselves the Benefit
 s gro. of his good *Council*) can to the mor-
 ot ex. tality that will unavoidably follow on
 we neglect. But the considering our
 for Seasons, may either ease us of the *Trouble*
 s of a Good will to them occasions to us, if
 if we. their Answers can be satisfactory: Or put
 et ne. upon safer *Expedients* for their own
 Good,

Good, if they should fall short of their own Expectation. Nor do we in the least prejudge them, if they can satisfy us that their Case is not so dangerous as we believe it. All we pretend to, in the meantime, is to awaken their Diligence in considering them, for which the Importance of the Matter is certainly a very proper inducement. Ignorance of Law is not allowed as pleadable in any Legal Court, when the Law it self, and the Punishment attending the Violation of it, are sufficiently notified. Nor is there any Relief of Equity admitted, if the Criminal himself cannot deny his having heard of the Law, and the severe Punishment threatned upon the Violation of it. That is presumed sufficient to oblige him, in regard of his Interest, to use all Moral Diligence to inform himself, where his Misinformation may prove of so Fatal Consequence to him. And the greater the Evil is, to which his Error may expose him, the greater Obligation is, to prevent an Error that will be so pernicious. This, and this alone, is my Design in being so plain and particular in my Charges against their Case, where their Persons are no otherwise concerned than as they are pleased to make that Case their own. It is to let them see their Obligation to examine the Reasons that make their Case so dangerous; and that they

not at the same Liberty, *not* to trouble themselves with a serious and accurate *Examination* of them, as they might have been, if the *Case* concerning them had been *secure*, or not so very *dangerous* as indeed it is. And who can deny their *Case* to be *dangerous*, if it be such as our *Reasons* not prove it, if they be indeed *conclusive*? If they can *neither* pretend to *Remission* of their *Sins*, tho' otherwise *qualified*, if they had been of the *Body* to which the *Promise* of *Remission* belonged: If they can pretend no *Interest* in *Christ*, neither of being the *one Body*, nor *one Spirit*, with him: If they be *destitute* of the *Spirit* of *Christ*, and, for that Reason, still *subject* to the *Devil*, the capital *Enemy* of *Christ*, and thereby consequently liable to the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*: Who can deny, but that these are *Considerations* sufficient to excite their utmost *Diligence*, at least, as to an impartial *Examination*? That is all that I design at present, not any way *prejudging* concerning the *Event*. If, upon that *Examination*, they can prove their present Condition *secure*, I shall heartily *congratulate* their *Success*. If they cannot, I know no *Expedient* that they can then be able to pretend for *securing* themselves, but that to which I have been so importunately *urging* them, that of a timely Return to a *safer Communion*, which can then be no other but *Episcopal*.

An

An Hypothesis concerning Sacerdotal Remission of SINS.

That Sacerdotal Absolution, is necessary for the Remission of SINS, even of those who are truly Penitent.

1. **B**Y *Sacerdotal Absolution*, I understand the *Priest's* Approbation of the *Penitent*, as a Person *interess'd* in the *Promises* of *Remission* which are revealed in the *Gospel*, however it be signified; whether by express *Words*, as it had been the *Practice* of the *Later Church*; or by *Behaviour*, proper only to a Person so *qualified*.

2. By *Necessary*, I mean, not *absolutely* in regard of God; but *ordinarily*, in regard of the *Penitent*. So that the *Penitent* (who cannot expect the *Extraordinary* Uncommon Mercies of God for his Salvation) cannot expect *Remission* without this *Sacerdotal Absolution*, as a Condition *ordinarily* necessary.

3. By *Sins* I mean, not only such as are *notorious*, and *scandalous*, and of *Public* Cognizance; but all such also, whatever they may be, whereby the *Priest* may be able to judge concerning the *State* of the *Penitent*, however he came to know the

Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution. lxiii

Whether by *Personal Converse*, or *Private Information* by others, or the *Voluntary particular Confession* of the *Penitent* himself.

P R O O F.

That no truly *Penitent* Person can expect Prop. I.
remission of his *Sins* (at least in order to
obtaining those *Good Things* that are
promised in the *New Covenant*) by virtue
of the *Penitence* it self, without the *Divine*
Gracy and *Indulgence* accepting it; not for
his own *Worth*, but *God's Pleasure*.

Seeing therefore this *Acceptance* depends Prop. II.
on the *Divine Pleasure*, no *Penitent* can
secure himself of *Acceptance* by any other
means, than by such whereby he may be
assured that *God is pleased* to accept them.

The *Pleasure* of *God* to accept of *Peni-* Prop. III.
tence cannot otherwise be known, but by
his *Interest* in the *New Covenant*, wherein
he has been pleased to declare, that he will
accept of them.

This *Remission* of *Sins* promised in the Prop. IV.
New Covenant cannot (in an ordinary way)
be expected by any, but those who make
use of the *Ordinary Means* prescribed by the
New Covenant.

The *Ordinary Means* prescribed by the Prop. v.
New Covenant revealed in the *Gospel* for the
remission of *Sins*, are both the *Sacraments*.

But

Ixiv *Concerning Sacerdotal Absolutio*

But especially (for *daily* Inadvertence and *Relapses* after *Baptism*) that of *Holy Eucharist*.

Prop. VI. They who are by God empowered to admit to, or exclude from, the *Eucharist* (the *Sacrament* concerning *adult* Christians) of whom we are now chiefly discoursing are also empowered to *apply* this *Covenant-Remission*, or exclude from it; that without their *Consent*, no *Application* can be made.

Prop. VII. *Priests*, are they who are thus empowered to admit to, or exclude from, the *Eucharist* under the *Gospel*.

This Power of the *Priests*, for excluding from, or admitting to, the *Sacraments*, appears from these following Considerations.

1. *They*, and they only, can admit to, or exclude from, the *Sacraments*; who have *Dominion* over the *Exterior Symbols*.

2. *They*, and they only, have the *Dominion* of these *Exterior Symbols*, who have the Power of *Consecrating* them.

3. *They*, and they alone, have the *Power* of *Consecrating* these *Symbols*, who are *Legally* called thereunto.

4. *They*, and they only, are *Legally* called hereunto, who are separated for this employment by those who are already invested with the *Original Supreme* and *Independent* Power of the *Church*.

Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution.

lxv

5. None are thus *separated* for this Employment of *Consecrating the Eucharist*, but only *Priests*, in the utmost Primitive *Latitude* of the Word, as it contains not only those who are strictly and rigorously so called, but *Bishops* also.

6. This *Power*, which necessarily follows from this *Appropriation* of the *Dominion* of the *Sacramental Symbols* to the *Clerical Function*, cannot be conceived to be given by Christ to them *unawares*, but *designedly*.

7. Christ therefore *designing* to put the *Ordinary Means* of *Remission* of *Sins* into the *Power* of the *Priesthood*, must consequently oblige all to a *Dependance on*, and a *Subjection to*, the *Priesthood*, under *Pain* of *Deprivation* of the *Ordinary Means* of the *Remission* of their *Sins*.

8. This *Obligation* will extend to all Cases wherein Men cannot *expect*; nay, he *Da*d be sure of, God's *supplying* his *Want* of *Ordinary Means* by *Extraordinary Favours*. For no *Prudent* Person would venture himself on *Extraordinaries*, where he might have any *Hopes* left of being supplied by *Ordinary Means*.

9. There can be no *Hopes* of *Extraordinary Favours* but on a perfect *Impossibility*, either *Physical*, or *Legal*, of obtaining *Ordinary Means*.

d

10. This

lxvi Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution

10. This *Impossibility* cannot be pretended, where the *Ordinary Means* may had, either by any *Moral Diligence*, or any *not unlawful Compliance*.

11. The Design of all this seems to oblige all *Laicks* to a Voluntary Obedience to their *Clergy*, (even in *Times of Persecution*, when no other Means can be used by a sense of their own greatest Interest which is so highly concerned in paying Obedience.

12. Supposing the Preservation of *Priest's Authority* to be the End of the Design of *Christ*, that *Right* of the *Priest* will be the principal thing necessary to be secured by this Obedience. So that the Reception of the *Elements* will be no other necessary to the *Remission* of our *Sins*, than as our Duty to receive those *Elements* in order to that *Remission*, obliges us to do so on the Consent of the *Priests*, who alone give us those *Elements*, and who alone oblige God to ratify in Heaven what is transacted by them in Earth, by the Authority they have received from God himself.

13. However, this way of giving *External Symbols*, is the *Ordinary Means* whereby *Christ* himself has obliged *Persons* to be admitted as *Members* of the *Body*, so as may most advance the

10. *Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution.* lxvii

ification of the People in a way of sensible
ay Devotion.

or 14. Yet where these *Arbitrary Means*
cannot conveniently be provided, (whether
to through want of the *Elements*, or of a con-
Obvenient Number of Communicants requisite
of for the Solemnity) there the Priest admit-
e using of the Person as fitted for the Reception
ntent of the Symbols, if they might be had, by
ng the Form of Words, signifying his Approbation
of the Qualifications of the Person for re-
of giving the Symbols themselves: This Act,
of say, of the Priest may (by this Reason-
Prog) as certainly apply the Benefit of the
y to covenant to the Person so disposed, as if the
the Exterior Symbols themselves were admini-
thered to him.

ns, 15. But whether of these two Means be to
nents used (I mean of the Symbols themselves
to de of a Verbal Absolution) the Communicant
alone to be concluded by the Priest, as the com-
alone sent Judge. The Priest's Right, not the
is communicants, being here principally con-
orityned; It thence follows that the Judgment
the Priest, not of the Communicants, con-
iving the convenient time for giving the
ary Exterior Symbols themselves, is herein to be
ed Principally regarded.

obatio 16. The Priest therefore being the Com-
rs of sent Judge of this Case; it follows that,
the ough he were mistaken in omitting the use

lxviii Concerning Sacerdotal Absolutio

of the *Elements* without sufficient *need* yet, the *Remission* of *Sins* (being ground on the *Priests Right* of *admitting* to *Privilege* of *Remission* by way of *Covenant* is as *Validly* made over to the *Penitent*, if he had not been so *mistaken*.

This *Hypothesis*, I conceive, to proceed on the most *unexceptionable* Principles any that I have seen, most of its *Foundations* being *admitted* by our separating *versaries* themselves. I take it also to be most conformable to the *Evidence* of *Scripture*, and *Catholick* (especially *Primitive Tradition* in these matters. It neither *firms* any thing that is not *expressly* taught by the *Scriptures* and that *Tradition*; *determines* any thing that was then permitted to the *liberty* of *private Disputants*. I further take it to be most agreeable to *Jewish* and *Heathen Practices* (from whence those *Rituals* were principally derived of expiating *Piacular Criminal Pen*. Withall it seems to me to give the *Rational Account*, why, under such a *ritual Oeconomy*, (as that is of our common *Christianity* professedly designed for the *Elevation* of *Mens Minds* above *unnecessary Condescension* to *Sense*) should yet be pleased to *approve* and *stitute* the *Eternal Observation* of some *Rituals*, which might *Cement* the *E*

Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution. lxix

nal Unity of the *Visible Body* of the *Church* in this *World*. It is the further recommendation of this same *Hypothesis*, that it keeps the *Mean* betwixt making the *Absolution* of the *Priest* so *Operative*, as to excuse the *Penitent* from some part of his *Duty*; or, on the contrary, the *Penitence* of the *Person* (even when supposed *True*) so *Self-sufficient* as to supersede the necessity of the *External Intervention* of the *Priest*, for completing the *Absolution*, so necessary for the *Penitent*. These are the two *Extremes* under which all other *Hypotheses*, I think, have laboured. Nor is it less serviceable for removing those mutual *misunderstandings*, which the *inconvenient Explications* of these very important *Affairs* have occasioned, even among *Candid* and *Intelligent Persons*.

The Contents of the Præmonition.

THE Fragments of the Letters which occasioned the following Discourse, §. 1. The German mistakes my Hypothesis, when he takes it to suppose the actual Mortality of all who are out of the Peculium, §. 2. The actually Immortalized Souls to Punishment, may, possibly be better assigned to the Pleasure of God, than to the Divine Spirit, §. 3. The Souls that are common to all Mankind, do not so depend on our gross organized bodies, as that they must necessarily perish on the Dissolution from their Bodies, §. 4. This perpetuating of Human Nature for Punishment could not be justly inflicted till a Publication of God's Pleasure, that he judged the Devil a lick Enemy; and that all who did not join his Body instituted by himself, should be taken for associates of the Devil, and punished accordingly, §. 5. The Publication of the Devil as an Enemy, began from the beginning of the Gospel, §. 6. It is supposed in the Preaching of the Blessed Saviour, and of St. John the Baptist, that the Rabbins perfectly ignorant of any Divine Revelation concerning the natural Immortality of human Souls in general, §. 8. The Right heretofore rested on of the Bishops alone for conferring the Spirit, destroys all Right to the Mystical and heavenly Communion, in them who are divided from their respective Bishops, §. 9. This dependence of the Episcopacy, for receiving the Spirit, concerning the Case of all Separatists from Episcopacy, as Enthusiasts, §. 10. An applicatory Address to the Separatists, intreating them to consider the Reasons, here offered, impartially, §. 11. Hypothesis concerning Sacerdotal Remission of Sins, P. lxii.

T H E

C O N T E N T S

O F T H E

Epistolary Discourse.

T H E Address. §. 1. *The Scripture owns all our Title to Immortality to proceed from the Spirit. Yet so, as to own the Immortality of them to punishment, who hear the Gospel, tho' they do not receive it.* §. 2. *The Form of proceeding in the general Judgment, mentioned by our Saviour, supposes all who are to be concerned in that Judgment, to have heard of the Gospel.* §. 3. *The Scripture plainly supposes a great difference between the Punishment of them who never had heard of the Gospel,*

d 4

spel,

lxxii C O N T E N T S.

spel, and of those who had heard of, and rejected it. §. 4. Unbelievers are the Persons designed in the Scripture for eternal Punishments. Who must therefore be supposed to have heard of the Gospel. §. 5. The Place of St. John v. 28, 29. answered. §. 6. The Doctrine of deriving Immortality from the Divine Spirit, is perfectly agreeable to the Notions received by the Jews in the Apostolical Age. §. 7. It is also agreeable to those Heathen Originals, from whence the Phrases of the New Testament concerning this Matter are derived. §. 8. The Doctrine is owned by S. Justin Martyr. §. 9. And by Tatian. §. 10. And S. Irenæus. §. 11. And Athenagoras. §. 12. And Theophilus Antiochenus. §. 13. Tertullian thought the Soul ex traduce, and therefore naturally Mortal. §. 14. The Opinion of Tertullian, though generally deserted in the end of the 4th Century (when the Opinion that favoured the natural Immortality of the Soul began)

CONTENTS. lxxiii

*f, was not, even then, condemned. §. 15. Tertullian is also otherwise very full in as-
for setting the natural Mortality of the
the Soul, and in deriving its actual Immor-
of tality from the Spirit. §. 16. Origen
Johnew no Tradition of the Church in his
be Age against that Opinion of Tertullian,
om though himself differed greatly from it.
able No, nor Pamphilus, nor Eusebius. §.
in 17. S. Cyprian owns the same Distin-
agrition between our first Birth, by which we
, freceive our Souls, and the second Birth,
Te by which we receive the Spirit. §. 18.
eriv Arnobius owns our Souls mortal in their
S. own Nature, and immortal only by the
Tati Spirit. §. 19. So also Lactantius. §.
A. 20. S. Athanasius owns the natural
neop Mortality of the Soul, and ascribes its
tull actual Immortality to the Spirit received
the from the Λόγος. §. 21. The same S.
Athanasius, and the Catholick Church
eneroith him, prove the Necessity of our Savi-
centour's assuming even the Supreme part of
be na our Human Souls against the Apolli-
an) narists, that even that might be rescued
from*

were to be judged, are supposed by the Apostle to perish, rather than to be concerned in the Judgment relating to Breakers of the Law. §. 35. Yet they might probably persevere in their Belief till the day of the general Judgment. The Punishment of the Sodomites in Hell-Fire. §. 36. Nor could it be Hell-Fire which S. Jude (in the Case of the Sodomites) calls Eternal Fire. §. 37. The *ætern*, which is in all Men, (though it be of a Divine Original, yet) does not make us actually Immortal, but only dispose us for a Union with the Spirit. §. 38. No Ordinary Means settled for conveying the Spirit before the Gospel. §. 39. Faith is (by the terms of the Gospel) requisite for receiving the Immortalizing Spirit. §. 40. Therefore the Antients (even of the Apostolical Age) believed that our Saviour preached to the separate Souls of the deceased before the Incarnation. §. 41. Water-Baptism also necessary (by the terms of the Gospel) for receiving the Spirit.

W

CONTENTS. lxxvii

*Which the Ancients believed to have been
 given to the separate Souls of them who
 had no means of attaining it when living,*
 §. 42. *Renunciation of the Devil,*
necessary for the Spirit. Which was also
believed performable in the separate state,
to those who could not know their Duty
before. §. 43. The Gentiles also are
owned by Hermas to have received the
Spirit, by our Saviour's Baptism, in their
separate State. §. 44. Our Saviour's
teaching was only to the Souls of the
Just, the Apostles was also to those of
the Gentiles, according to the Doctrine
of Clemens Alexandrinus. §. 45. No
Antichristian Covenants can oblige Poste-
rior to consent to the hazard of Eternal
torment. §. 46. God's appropriating
The Old Peculium did not exclude the
Antichristians, then living, from the Benefit
of the New Peculium, relating to their
Souls. §. 47. The highest part of the
Imortal Soul (as distinguished from
the Divine Spirit) is called a Spirit. Yet
it is naturally Mortal. §. 48. Yet it is, in a
lower

lxxviii C O N T E N T S.

lower *Sense*, Divine, *as being of*
 Divine Original, *and as qualifying*
for a Union with that truly Divine S
pirit, by which we are actually Imm
talized. §. 49. *The Primitive Chri*
ans suppose this distinction of the T
Souls in Man, as Fundamental, in the
Disputes with their Co-æval Heretics
 §. 50. *They also suppose the Reaso*
nable Soul it self to be a Derivative
from Christ, as the Λόγος. §. 51. *Our S*
Saviour, as Christ, was anointed in our
Human Nature, by the fulness of our
Divine Spirit. And, on that account
as well as that of the Λόγος, he gaine
Right of being styled the Son of God
 §. 52. *That same Spirit being the Spirit*
of the Father, but derived to us by his
Saviour, will make us the Sons of God
and Brethren of our Saviour. §. *no*
The Spirit abiding in us, is a Pre
gative of the Gospel. What is meant
that Form of Speech. §. 54. *The s*
distinction appears in this, that the
is the proper "Adms for separate Sou

CONTENTS. lxxix

first Heaven is the proper Abode of the Spirit. §. 55. This Spirit is the Principle of Mystical Unity, as obliging all that receive it, to depend on him from whom they all Originally received it. What is meant by 'Αυτοζωή, or having Life in themselves. §. 56. Thus therefore all Members of Churches were obliged to depend on their respective Governours, in order to the receiving of the Spirit. §. 57. The Spirit was not, in the earliest Ages, thought derivable to any Members of the Churches, but from the Heads of those Churches. §. 58. None but Bishops were left, by the Apostolical Age, in possession of this Power of giving the Spirit. And they gave it by Unction, by which none could consecrate besides themselves. §. 59. A naturally mortal Soul is more agreeable to be joined with a naturally mortal Body, as a Concomitant of Human Nature, than a Soul naturally Immortal. §. 60. By this Unction, the best and clearest Account may be given of the truly Catholick

lxxx: C O N T E N T S.

lick Doctrine of Original Sin. §. 61.
The same Distinction gives an easie account of the Doctrine of Reprobation so far as that Doctrine is Scriptural
§. 62. *It gives withal, the easiest account of the Justice of Eternal Torments particularly, with relation to the Case of Infants dying Unbaptized, and Heathens who never heard of the Gospel*
§. 63. *The Conclusion.* §. 64.

T H

6
e a
tion
ura
oun
ents
Caf
nd
ofpe

T H E
DISTINCTION
B E T W E E N
Soul and Spirit,

Asserted from
Scripture and the Purest Antiquity.

A N D
The Great Use of that *Distinction*
shewn, in several of the *Diffi-*
cultest Questions in Divinity.

HONoured SIR,
Received both your Papers by Mr. Gad- I.
derer. But, not knowing who, or The Ad-
where you were, I was in hopes of a drefs.
H Personal Conference with you, on the
jects mentioned by you, when my Af-
s should call me to London. I was a-
re of the popular *Prejudices* against the
nions you speak of, and was unwilling
B to

to concern them any farther in the Disputes that occasion'd them, than needs must, if I might have any Prospect of carrying my principal Cause against the Schism without concerning them in it. Beside I was afraid that a Subject of that Consequence, and wherein so many things were to be asserted against the most received Opinions, might take me off, and detain me too long from my other Studies; especially if they should prove less important to the *Publick*, than those from which they must divert me. These Considerations make me loath to think of writing, which might have the Advantage of debating your Subjects by word of Mouth; yet finding these popular Prejudices to increase, have at length been prevailed on, to enquire what Reason can be pretended for them; and to communicate the Result of my Enquiry to the *Publick*, that others may judge of them, as well as I my self, especially my truly *Catholick Superiors*.

2. I do not, I dare not, prescribe to our Judges. But this I can assure you, that the Sentiments you think so hardly of, would not be more acceptable to me, than they are to you, if I thought them either *Scriptural*, or against any truly *Catholick Principles*. So firmly we are agreed in the Immortality of them to Punishment, who hear the Gospel, they do not receive it.

The Scripture owns all our Title to Immortality to proceed from the Spirit. Yet so, as to own the Immortality of them to Punishment, who hear the Gospel, they do not receive it.

those Standards of *Revealed Truth*. This I hope, may qualifie me for your Favour, in what I have to say. In truth, I am sensible how much I am beholden to your Favour, because I am conscious how little I have deserved it, and therefore dare not be so *ingrateful* as to *distrust* your Favour. But what is it, I beseech you, that can be thought, I do not say *Anti-Scriptural*, but even *Unscriptural*, in the Hypothesis on which I reason? Is it that I distinguish the *two Men*, the *Earthly*, and the *Heavenly*? Is it that I distinguish the two *εἰκόνες* of those two Men, and make the *ψυχὴ*, to be the *εἰκὼν* of the *Earthly Man*; and the *πνεῦμα* to be the *εἰκὼν* of the *Heavenly*? And does not the Apostle either expressly say, or as plainly suppose, those things in his Reasoning in 1 Cor. 15. as I do? Is it that I make the *ψυχὴ* a *Mortal Principle*, and the *σάρξ ψυχικὴν*, called so from that Principle, *Mortal* also? or that I make the *ψυχὴ*, and not the *πνεῦμα*, to be all that we derive from the *Earthly Adam*, and whereby we bear the *εἰκὼν* of the *Protoplast*? And does not the Reasoning of the Apostle suppose all these things as plainly as I do? Why else does he expressly affirm, that we all die in *Adam*, supposing us to be in *Adam*, while we only bear his *εἰκὼν*, as we are in *Christ*, by bearing his *εἰκὼν*, which is the *Heavenly Spirit*? Why does he suppose this

ψυχικὸν σῶμα to be *corruptible* and *mortal*
 in *opposition* to the πνευματικὸν σῶμα, with
 which when it is *invested* (that is the Ap-
 stle's own Phrase, ἐνδύσαθ' 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54
 ἐπενδύσαθ', 2 Cor. v. 3, 4.) it is thencefor-
 ward said to have put on *Incorruption* and
Immortality? *ib.* Why does he derive
 the Title to the Resurrection from Christ,
 it be due to all those, who neither were
 nor were *qualified* to be *his*, as he is Christ
 in *any* Sense; not even that *lowest* Sense,
 least, of being *visible* Members of his Mys-
 tical Body, the Church? Such are by
 means *qualified* for the higher Mystical Un-
 ion of the Spirit; and whoever has *not* the
 Spirit of Christ, is *none* of his, Rom. viii.
 To be sure he cannot pretend it on Account
 of *this* Reasoning of the Apostle, that
 derives all Title to the Resurrection from the
 very same Spirit. The Apostle's other Rea-
 sonings, do also *immediately* derive this Ti-
 tle from Christ himself. If there be no Re-
 surrection of the Dead, then is Christ not
 risen, v. 13. If the Dead rise not, then is
 Christ raised, v. 16. These Reasonings
 only reach them who *sleep in Jesus*. 1 Thes.
 iv. 14. the Dead in Christ, v. 16. not
 opposed to them who are dead out of Christ
 but to those Christians who shall be alive
 the Resurrection, v. 17. For as Adam and
 Eve are called Adam, Gen. v. 2. so Christ
 and his Church are called Christ, 1 Cor. x.

12. And *Christians* are said to be in *Christ*, as well as *Christ* in *them*, *John* xvii. 23. *Rom.* viii. 1. xvi. 7. But then they are said to be in *Christ* who profess him, though they do not live answerably to their Profession. As *Judas*, the *Son of Perdition*, is said to be given to *Christ* by his *Father*, *John* xii. 12. And they are said to be bought by *Christ*, who deny the *Lord* that bought them, and who, by denying him, do bring upon themselves swift Destruction, *2 S. Pet.* ii. 1. As they are said to go out of the Church, who never were really of the Church, *1 S. John* ii. 19. So *Christ's Net* includes the Bad as well as the Good Fish, *S. Matth.* xiii. 47, 48. As the *Field of Christ* contains the Tares as well as the Good Seed, *v.* 24, 25. And this very agreeable to the Design himself so frequently owns in the Scriptures, of punishing them the most severely, who had been admitted to the greatest Favours, as thereby making their Wickedness the more particular. This will perfectly reach all that have been actually profelyted to the Christian Religion, and admitted actually into Christian Communion. Nor can it be thought hard dealing, if God be pleased to oblige (that hear of the Gospel, and have it in their Power to be so admitted, if they please) to entitle themselves to Eternal Rewards, under pain (in case of their being wanting to themselves therein) of incurring

ring *Eternal Punishments*. This also seems rather agreeable to the *Design* of God to do so, when the Apostles insist on this Topic of the *future Judgments* for obliging *Profelytes* to come over to the Christian Religion. So St. Paul does with the *Athenians*, *Acts* xvii. 31. and with *Felix*, *Acts* xxiv. 24. plainly intimating, that they must be concerned in that Judgment, if they did not secure themselves by embracing the Gospel and the true Communion: so they also explain themselves, when consulted by the Auditors, what they should do to be saved. *Acts* ii. 38. 40. xvi. 31. No doubt the Salvation intended in these Cases, was from that which is elsewhere called *the Wrath* to come. Thus this Hypothesis will concern all who have the Gospel preached to them. And it does not appear by the accounts that general Judgment given in the Gospel that any were concerned in that Judgment besides those who had warning of that Judgment, by having the Gospel preached to them.

3.
The form
of proceeding
in the
general
Judgment
mentioned
by our Sa-
viour, sup-
poses all,
who are to

Our Saviour himself, in his own Description of it, ascribes all the Rewardableness of the good Works of the Righteous, their having been done for his sake. He could not otherwise say; *In as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these Brethren, ye have done it unto me*, S. Matthew. xi. 23. *Forasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it unto me*, S. Matthew. xxv. 40. *Forasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it unto me*, S. Matthew. xxv. 40.

be concerned in that Judgment, to have heard of the Gospel.

xxv. 40. So, on the contrary, he imputes the *Punishableness* of the *Uncharitableness* of the *Wicked*, to their affronting and neglecting *himself*, in neglecting the Performance of good Offices to the meanest of his Members ; *In as much as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me*, v. 45. Both these Sentences suppose the Persons concerned in them, not ignorant that *Christ* had undertaken to reward Benefits conferred, and to *punish* Neglects of doing such Benefits, to the Members of his *Mystical Body*. Yet his making such a Body, and the *Obligation* resulting thence to concern *himself* for them, being things wholly depending on his Arbitrary *Pleasure*, were impossible to be *known*, without the *Revelations* he was pleased to make of his *Pleasure* in the *Gospel*. It was impossible for any to do *Charity* on *Christ's* Account, or to *affront* him in neglecting it, who never had heard that there was a *Christ*, or that he had been pleased to concern *himself* in the *Benefits* or *Injuries* of his *Worshippers*. These *Forms* therefore could never affect Persons who had never heard of the *Revelations* of the *Gospel* : If therefore such Persons are to be judged there, it must be by another Form which cannot be *known*, and therefore ought not to be *believed*, till it can be proved from the *Scriptures*. Yet I exclude not the good *Deeds* and *Sins* of the *present*

before *Christ's coming*, from those *Rewards* and *Punishments*. For *Christ*, as the *Λόγος* was their *Governour then*, as their *Governor* *ment* was *Theocratical*, which was a *Favor* granted then to *no other Nation* but *theirs*. For the *Father* was not supposed to govern them *immediately*, but was supposed to have committed all *Judgment* to the *Son*, *S. Jo. v. 22.* And therefore the *Ἐπιτάφια* or *Appositions* of the *Deity* in the *Old Testament* generally in the *New Testament* supposed to have been of the *Λόγος*, the *Father* being conceived to dwell in the *Light unapproachable*, whom *no Man* either hath seen, or can see and live. Accordingly they who tempted *God* in the *Wilderness* are said to have tempted *Christ*, *1 Cor. x. 9.* and elsewhere to grieve *his Holy Spirit*. That *Spirit* which, in the *Reasoning*, is supposed to immortalize to *Punishment*. So also *Christ* is said to have preached to the *Spirits in prison*, in the days of *Noah*, *1 S. Per. iii. 18, 19, 20.* as commonly conceived. Those *Spirits*, as have shewn in my *Discourse* concerning *Marriages*, were the *Descendants* of *Seth* who were supposed to have been restored to the *Spirit* which *Adam* lost by his *Fall*. And this was, in this way of *Reasoning* conceived sufficient to make the *Injury* redounded to *Christ* whose *Spirit* they had received, and (upon their *Fall*) to immortalize them to *Punishment*. These, by the

New Testament Reasonings, are concerned in the last Judgment. But where does the *New Testament* suppose that *they* shall be concerned in it, who knew nothing of *Christ*, or the *Λόγος*, or of any Concern they had with him? Your *Texts*, I think, prove no such matter. The *Children of the Kingdom*, S. *Matth.* viii. 12. were not only *Jews*, who had a *Title* to the *Spirit* in *Reversion*, which was sufficient to qualify them for that higher degree of *Punishment*, of the *οὐρανός*, the same with *τάραχος*, proper for those only of a *Divine Nature*; but were such of them also as had *heard* and *rejected* the *Preaching* of the *Gospel*. For such only were *cast out*, by the *Apostles* casting off the *Dust* of their *Feet* for a *Testimony* against them. As for your other *Text*, *Acts* xvii. 31. of *God's* judging the *World* in *Righteousness*; the *Apostle's* *Design* is fully answered, if it fully reached the *Case* to which the *Apostle* applies it, that is, of all those to whom he was then *Preaching*. And they to be sure had *heard* the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. Nor does the *Word* *World* necessarily imply any larger *Signification*. The *Apostles* were the *Light* of the *World*, S. *Matth.* v. 14. most certainly not that part of the *World* which lived *before*, and could not therefore *hear* their *Instructions*, nor *receive* them as conveyed by *Tradition*. So the *Pharisees* observe that the

whole

The Distinction between

whole World was gone after our Saviour, *Joh. xii. 19.* Here it was impossible that more could be meant than *they* who lived in our Saviour's time, and heard his Preaching. Yet even *they* are called, not only *World*, but the *whole World*, which is more comprehensive Expression than that which is used in your Text. Your Text *Hebr. x. 27.* wants the *universal* Particle on which your Argument is grounded. The words are, *ὃ καὶ ὅτι ἀποθανέτω τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπασι ἀποθανέτω, μετὰ ᾧ τὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ*. Nor does the Force of the Apostle's Argument require it. The Emphasis lies on the Particle *ἅπασι*, that is sufficient to infer what the Apostle collects in the following Verse: That it was not requisite for Christ as a Man, to die any more than once: but that, as other Men, after that one Death were to be judged; so Christ also, after his passage through that one Death, had no further part of his Mediatorial Office to be performed by him, but that of his Share in the Judgment, that of a Judge on the Tribunal, not that of Ordinary Men, as Criminals at the Bar. The whole stress of the Argument lies on these two things: that the Death was to be but once, and that the Judgment was to follow after it. Not in the least on the Universality, either of the Death or the Judgment. You mistake my Sentiments concerning the Jews, as if I did not

Soul and Spirit, &c.

II

think *them* liable to *Eternal Punishments*, as well as the *Christians*. They who heard the Gospel might, as I have shewn, very justly be obliged to chuse *Eternal Rewards*, under Pain of *Eternal Punishments*. And they who lived *before* the Gospel, and could not hear, yet, as they were intitled to the Spirit in *Reversion*, so might be intitled to the *Consequences* of the Spirit; one of which was to make them *immortal* in the State to which they should be intitled by the Use of their *Free Will*, whatever that State was, whether of *Reward* or *Punishment*.

And really the Revelations of the New Testament are very clear in owning a very great difference in the *Punishment* of those who should *resist* and *reject* the Gospel, from what it would have been, if they had never heard of the Gospel. What else can be the meaning of those plain Words of St. Paul? *The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by the man whom he hath ordained*, Acts xviii. 30, 31. So the same Apostle elsewhere; *Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways*, xiv. 16. The Words are, *καὶ ἡμεῖς* and *ἐξ ὧν* which could not properly be used on this Occasion, if God had obliged all other Nations, as well as the Pe-

culum,

4.
The Scri-
pture
plainly sup-
poses a
great dif-
ference
between the
Punish-
ment of
them who
never had
heard of
the Gospel
and those
who had
heard of,
and re-
jected, it.

The Distinction between

culium, to worship *himself*, before he revealed his Pleasure to them : And if he had resolved to *punish* them for not doing so, with *Eternal Torments*. The Words rather plainly imply the contrary ; That while the *Supreme God* was ἀγνῶστος, (that is plainly the ἀγνοία alluded to) God would *excuse* them from that *Duty*, on Account of that *Ignorance* of what otherwise would have been their *Duty*, if it had been required from *them*, and they had *known* that the *Supreme Being* had *required* it. But that *God* was for the *future* pleased to insist on it ; and that they must not *hereafter* [nor, from the time the *Apostle* as *God's Herald* promulged this *New Law* : So that they could not hence-forward *pretend* the like *Ignorance*,] I say, that they must *hereafter* expect the like *Indulgence* as was allowed them *before*. It is plainly *proclaiming* God's *Pleasure* in a Case of which they were *ignorant before*, that *God* would *judge* the *World*, and that our *Blessed Lord* was appointed for the *Judge* to whom they must give up their *Accounts*. This agrees exactly with the Account our *Lord himself* gives of that *Judgment* ; that he would reckon all the *good* and *ill* Offices of men that should *appear* before him, as offered to *himself*. And, upon this *new Authentic Publication* of God's *Pleasure*, he *further* declares, That they must not look

New Law, as formerly, as concerning
 his *own People the Jews*, but *all Men*;
 as confined to *Palæstine*, and the *seve-*
ral Residences of the Jewish Colonies, but as
 obliging *every where*; and that *all Mankind*
 should receive the *Gospel* revealed by *Christ*,
 they would answer the contrary at their
Day, when they should appear before his
Tribunal, at that *Day* which *God* had ap-
 pointed for judging them. This *Reasoning*
 plainly supposes their *Concern* in that *Judg-*
ment, to commence from the *Time* of the
promulgation of this New Law; from which
 time their *Ignorance* could not pretend
 to be *invincible*. So far is it from sup-
 posing every *Individual Man* to be con-
 demned in it. And indeed the *Scripture*
 does every where suppose the Condition
 of those who resist the *Gospel-Dispensation*,
 worse than those of the worst sort of *Cri-*
iminals who never heard of the *Gospel*. So
Peter; *It had been better for them not*
to have known the way of Righteousness, than
if they have known it, to turn from the
Commandment delivered unto them:
St. Pet. ii. 21. This is the same *Igno-*
rance, and the same *Commandment* now
 mentioned by *St. Paul*. Thus the Condi-
 tion of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, and even of *Sodom*,
 said to be *more tolerable* in the *Day* of
Judgment, than that of *Chorazin*, and *Beth-*
saida, and *Capernaum*; where our Saviour
 had

had done his *mighty Works*, attesting his *Authority* for publishing this *New Commandment*, St. Matth. xi. 21, 22, 23, 24. St. Luk. x. 12, 13, 14, 15. This *Tolerance* must relate rather to the *Evils*, than to the *Excusableness* of their *Case*; in regard of the greater *Evidence* used for reclaiming the *one*, than the *other*. And the *Case* is clear upon these *Principles*, that the *Punishment* of the *Juzn*, and of those who were only *Psychical*, would not extend to the *outer Darkness*, and the *nethermost Hell*, which was to be the *Share* of those who were *Pneumatical*. And our *Saviour* seems to allude to it in these words; *And thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell*. Intimating that the *Capernaïtes* *Capacities* of *Heaven* by having the *Gospel* *Preached* to them was the very *Consideration* that made them *liable* to the *Punishment* of *Hell*, which they had no *reason* to *fear* who never had received that *Favour* from *God*, who might have entitled them to *extraordinary* and *supernatural* *Rewards*.

5. Unbelievers are the Persons designed in the Scriptures for Eternal Punishments; who must therefore be supposed to have heard of the Gospel.

To this purpose serve those many *Things* that are commonly observed, yet for *other* purpose, that make *Hell*, in a *peculiar* way, the *Reward* of *Unbelievers*. So, *that believeth not, shall be damned*, St. Mat.

that believeth not, shall be damned, St. Mat.

xvi. 16. This is plainly spoken of *disbelieving* the Gospel, when preached. And the *parable* relates to the *xpious* which belongs to our Lord, as Judge at the last Judgment. So, *He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the Name of the only-begotten Son of God,* St. Joh. iii. 18. By ranking themselves among those whom he has already declared as belonging to his *Left Hand*. So, *He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him,* vers. 36. *That they all might be damned, who believe not the Truth,* 2 Thess. ii. 12. So Hell is called the *Portion of Unbelievers,* St. Luk. xii. 46. *But the fearful, and unbelievers, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death,* Rev. xxi. 8. That other *Criminals* are added here, is to shew, that even the *Profession* of the True *Communion* will not secure Persons guilty of such *flagitious* Sins from the *Portion of Unbelievers*, if they add not a further Care of securing themselves by their *Repentance*. But the *Unbelief* here spoken of, is not So, a *fiducial Recumbency* on the *Mercies* of *Christ*, as they fanſie who are fullest of Texts that mention it, but the *disbelief* of the *Revelations* of the Gospel, when-

when-ever they are sufficiently proposed. So the *Scriptures* themselves explain it. *In flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, 2 Thess. i. 8, 9. What shall be the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God? 1 S. Pet. iv. 17. Unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the Truth, but obey Unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every Soul of Man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile, Rom. ii. 8, 9. That it is that the $\pi\sigma\omicron\iota$ and $\alpha\pi\sigma\omicron\iota$ take in all the two opposite $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omega\nu\iota\varsigma$ of Righteousness and Unrighteousness, of Light and Darkness, of Christ and Belial, of God and Idol. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15, 16. So S. Paul. And S. John in his first Epistle, supposes all who are out of the true Communion, for that very Reason, to be in a State of Error and Darkness, and Death. The Darkness is that in which the Devil is the Prince and Ruler. And the Death is the second Death. Thus therefore it appears, that in the Scripture-Reasoning, the Faithful and the Unfaithful, exactly answer the two States concerned in the general Judgment, the Right Hand and the Left, as heard by Christ, and his Adversary the Devil.*

Devil, as *Generals* of two *Armies* in *Hostility* against each other. The *Infidelity* therefore here meant, could not be a pure *negative non-belief*, but a *Criminal disbelief* of the *Gospel*, when *preach'd* to them; and *attested* by it's *extraordinary Credentials*. By these Men came to be *formed* into these two *opposite Parties*. They who *received* the *Gospel*, and were accordingly received into the *Church* by the *Sacramental Symbols*, were supposed to belong to *Christ*, and to that *Body* of which he was the *Head*. They who *opposed* it, or would not be *Profelyted* by it, whatever *else* they believed, or to whomsoever they were *joyned*, they were, by the *Christians*, reckoned as belonging to the *opposite Party* to *Christ*, which was headed by the *Devil*. If therefore their *disbelief* of the *Gospel* was the *Cognizance* by which this *Party* was distinguished, it could consist of *none* but such as had *heard* and *rejected* the *Gospel*; and therefore could include *none*, but such as *lived* under the *Gospel*, at least of those who were *not* *Originals* of the *Old Peculium*. It is the *Apostle's Reasoning*: *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a Preacher?* Rom. x. The same *Reasoning* holds here. It is impossible to *disbelieve*, as to *believe*, in him of whom they had not *heard*, or to hear of him without a *Preacher*. None there-

Occasion.
Comm.

therefore can be *concerned* in the *Sentence* that *Hell* which was prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, but they who *hear* of the *Gospel*, if none but *Disbelievers* of the *Gospel* be *concerned* in it. And this fully agrees with what I have observed already, of the *form* of that *Judgment*, as our *Saviour* has described it. And it also fully answers the *whole design* of the *Apostles*, as often they insist on this same *Topick*, to oblige those with whom they *dealt* (who either were *Profelytes*, or designed for such) to *Act conformably* to the *Injunctions* of the *Gospel*.

6. But there is a passage which may be thought *decisive* in this case. It is in the

The place of S. Joh. v. 28, 29, answered.

Words of our *Saviour*: *The hour is come in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation, S. Joh. v. 28, 29.* Here all that are in the *Graves* are said expressly to have their shares in one of the two *Final Sentences* of the last *General Judgment*: either the *Resurrection of Life*, or the other *Resurrection of Damnation*. If the *Words* were to be understood in the *Universality* they might imply, if no regard were had to the occasion of them: I might then be inclinable to believe that all men who had not heard of the *Gospel* in this *Life*

might

might be admitted to the favour of having it preached to them in their *separate* state, in order to the rendring them *unexcusable* at the *general Judgment*. But there is indeed *no reason* to understand them as intended by our Saviour himself to *mean* so *universally*. It is usual with these Eastern Writers especially, to use these *large* expressions, when they mean no more by them than was requisite for the *occasion* on which they use them. The *Gibeonites* tell *David*, on occasion of the *Famine* for breach of *Faith* to themselves, by *Saul*, That they would have *no silver nor gold of Saul, nor of his house*, neither for them should he kill any man in *Israel*. These Words are as *universal* as the *Words* we are now concern'd for. Yet they immediately demand *seven* of *Saul's Posterity* to be delivered to them to be put to death, 2 *Sam.* xxi. 4, 6, 9. So *Obadiah* concerning his Master *Abab's* diligence in enquiring for the Prophet *Elijah*: *As the Lord thy God liveth, there is no Nation or Kingdom, whither my Lord hath sent to seek thee: and when they said, he is not here; he took an Oath of the Kingdom and Nation, that they found thee not*, 1 *King.* xviii. 10. Yet none can think that he meant it of any other Nations or Kingdoms but those only which bordered on his own Kingdom of the *Ten Tribes*. So *S. Paul*, I thank God that I baptized none of you, but

The Distinction between

Crispus and Gaius, 1 Cor. i. 14. Yet he afterwards owns that he had Baptized others *And I baptized also the household of Stephanas besides, I know not whether I baptized another*, v. 16. So God granted to *S. Paul* that *sailed with him*, *Act. xxvii. 24*. Yet it was on that condition, that they all would *abide in the Ship*, v. 31. In this Case God himself was concerned; but as acting according to the *known and allowed Rules of Veracity* in dealings between man and man. So the *Spies at Jericho* gave their Faith to *Rahab* for the security of *her and her Family*, *Josh. ii. 14*. But upon conditions afterwards mention'd, v. 17, 18, 20. In all these places *Limitations* were intended, though the words were *indefinite, or general*, not intimating any *Limitations*. Nothing therefore can be concluded from the *Universality* of the *Expressions* in this present place. And it was perfectly *satisfactory* to our Saviour's *Design*, if all those who *heard him preach* those *Words* should rise out of their *Graves*, and should be adjudged to one of those States of a *Resurrection to Life*, or a *Resurrection to Damnation*. That was sufficient to *oblige* his Auditors to *embrace* his *Doctrine* on both the inducements, by which *Law-makers* secure the Obedience of their Subjects, of *Rewards and Punishments*. And I have withal shewn it agreeable to our Saviour's design in the places now mention'd

that he should *not* mean these Words in a larger sense than this, of those who had heard of the Gospel.

This, I conceive, worthy Sir, sufficient to shew that this Doctrine is not indeed so *Antiscriptural* as you suppose. And no more can be required according to the *usual* ways of proving Doctrines *Scriptural*. But it very much confirms me in my Reasonings of this kind, when I find an *Interpretation* of the *Scriptures* not only agreeable to the Words of the *Scriptures*; but agreeable also to the *Notions* and *Significations* of *Words*, and *Reasonings* then received. For that *sense* which was most likely to be then *understood*, was, in all *likelihood*, the *true* sense intended by the Holy Ghost *himself*. * Other-
 wise there could be no *security* that his *true* Sense could be conveyed to *future* Ages, if they had been *themselves* mistaken in it, to whose *understandings* the *Holy Ghost* was than particularly concern'd to *accommodate* himself. I say, if even *they* were *mistaken*, who were to be presumed the most *Authentic* *Originals*, and who were necessarily the *only* Persons who could be *intrusted* with the faithful *Conveyance* of what *themselves* had received for the use of their *Posterity*. And indeed, I am not *Conscious* of any thing, in the *Hypothesis* now mentioned. That is not perfectly *consistent* with the *Sentiments* of that *Age* wherein the Gospel was
 C 3 preached

7.

This Do-
 ctrine of
 deriving
 Immorta-
 lity from
 the Divine
 Spirit is
 perfectly a-
 greeable
 to the No-
 tions recei-
 ved by the
 Jews in
 the Apo-
 stolical
 Age.

* Vid. Pro-
 leg. Apo-
 log. ad D.
 Stearn. de
 Obstina-
 tione.

The Distinction between

preached by the *Apostles*, and the *Books* of the Sacred *Canon* were written. The *Rabbins* mention their *Nephefch*, *Ruach*, and *Neshamah*, answering the three Parts in Man in the New Testament, of *Body*, *Soul* and *Spirit*. But I confess, I am not confident of any thing delivered by *them* as a *Tradition* so ancient as the *Apostolical* Age. But *Plato* is clear in the distinction of *Nēs*, or *Νέσ* from *Ψυχή*, and allows it to be so great that the former could be the product of none but the *Supreme Being*, who could make nothing mortal or corruptible : and that the latter was left to the inferior *Demiurgical Deities*, who could make nothing immortal and incorruptible. So he is in his *Timæus*. And it is very notorious how much that Philosophy was received in the *Apostolical* Age, even among the *Jews* themselves, and how many of their terms are alluded to, not only in *Philo* and *Josephus* and the *Apocryphal Hellenists*, but in the *New Testament* also. The precarious fancy of *Des Cartes*, who makes every Cause of Motion distinct from Matter to be proper to what we call a *Spirit*, independent on Matter, and *Immortal*, was not (that we know of) thought of by any ; and is therefore at least very improper for explaining *Reasonings of Times*, when it was not thought True, so far they were then from Reasoning from it. And, I pray, what difference is there

there

there between those *Platonical* Notions, and those of the *New Testament*, but that the *Sacred Writers* more frequently call that πνεῦμα which the *Platonists* call λόγος or Νῆς? The reason of that difference is manifest, because the *Scripture* ascribes that *Superiour Power* in *Man* to a *Divine Breathing*, *Gen. ii. 7.* Yet even that very name from *breathing* is own'd by the *Heathens*, when they call the Soul, *Divinæ particulam auræ*, and the very name of *anima* or *animus* is from ἀνέμω. And *Seneca* uses the very word of the *New Testament* for that which he calls a *God* in *Man*, as the *Scripture* does, *Epist. 41. Philo*, as nearer to the *Apostles*, whilst they were under the *prejudices* of their *Jewish Education*, comes also nearer to them in this very *Expression*. He distinguishes clearly this πνεῦμα θεῶν infused by *God's Breathing*, from the *sensible formed Man*, which he makes to consist of *Body* and *Soul*, yet to be *Mortal*. His words concerning that *lower part* of *Man* are ;
 ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαπλάθεις ἡδὴ αἰωπητός — ἐκ σώ-
 ματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεσῶς, ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνή, φύσει
 θνητός ἐστί. Yet by the benefit of that πνεῦ-
 μα θεῶν he owns that the more *ignoble part*
 also is made *Immortal*. He says, it was
 sent higher, as to a *Colony*, ἐπ' ὠρεῖται τῆς
 γῆς ἡμῶν, ὅτι εἰ καὶ θνητὸν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν οὐρανὴν
 ἀναβιβάζει, κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀβυσσὸν ἀβανάζειται.
 So far the *Two Men*, the *Earthly* and the

De Mund.
 Op. p. 30,
 31.

The Distinction between

Heavenly are distinctly express'd. The *Platonists* also are as plain. They make also *Earthly* things to have their *παρὰδειγμα* their *ιδέας*, their *εἶδους* answering them in the *Mundus vultus*, the *Intellectual Sun*, the very same with their *Λόγος*. And they own the same difference between them, that the *Celestial Archetypes* were supposed *Incorruptible* and *Immortal*: The *Earthly Ectypes* no otherwise than as they received their *εἶδους* from their *Heavenly Original*, and, together with it, a participation of *Immortality* also. On the same Principles the *ἀνθρώποι κατὰ μέγεθος* were to receive together with their *τιμωσις*, their *Immortality* also, from the *αὐτοάνθρωπος* or *ἀνθρώπος εἰσώδης*, which they placed in the *Λόγος*, exactly as our *Sacred Writers* do of the *New Testament*. This gives a clear account how all *Human* *Immortality* must be derived from our *Blessed Lord*, as the *Λόγος*; and that none can pretend to it, who cannot shew their title to it, by their title to *Him*, as our

Alleg. l. 1. New Testament Writers suppose. Philo owns the same distinction of the Two Men elsewhere. That is not all. He, as convertant in the Scripture, owns the very name of Adam as common to both these Men. And what does the Apostle more, excepting his application of it to our Christ, whom Philo, as a Jew, did not acknowledge, either to be the Christ, or the Λόγος.

How.

However, by this *Philosophical Hypothesis*,
 it was from the Λύγ that these *exiled*
minds, *φυγάδες δούθεν ἐν ἀλήται*, were sup-
 posed to *fall*. And it was accordingly
 thought the *Office* of the same Λύγ, to
 restore them to their former dignity, by re-
 storing that *Diviner Principle* to which
 they had been *entitled*, as *Descendents* from
Adam, if *Adam* had not disabled himself for
 deriving it to *them* by losing it *himself*.
 This Λύγ or Νῆς, was taken by *Plato*
 for the *Wing* of the *Soul*, which enabled it
 to mount *above* the *subcelestial* Regions to
Heaven, which whatsoever *Soul* wanted,
 it was thereby disabled to recover its *for-*
mer Station. And it was taken for the *Of-*
fice of the Λύγ to send down those new
Coloni, as *Philo* calls them, which added
 to well disposed *Souls*, might enable them
 to recover *Heaven* from whence they were
 supposed to have *fallen*. This was there-
 fore taken for a *Divine Nature* (as *S. Peter*
 himself calls it, 2 *Ep.* i. 4) as it made them
Immortal, and as it raised them to the *place*
 of the *Gods* in the *lower* sense of the *Word*.
 So those *Gods* are described by their *Wor-*
shippers, that their *dwelling is not with flesh*,
Men. ii. 11. And by *Homer*, That they are
Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες. And the Λύγ
 was then to take care of *sending* down this
Celestial Colony, when he was to undertake
 the *πρωτάλιον* (that is *Plato's Word*) the
Helm

Helm of the *World* in his own Person, which was supposed to be at the beginning of the *Golden Age*. This is therefore the *Ne* Progenies from *Heaven*, in *Virgil*, *Eclog.* And the sending down these, is the reason why the *Gods* were supposed to be so familiar with *Men* in the *Golden Age*, because the *Men* then living were supposed to be generally to have enjoyed this *Divine Spirit*. On this account it is that *S. Paul* quotes the *Heathen Poet Aratus* with Approbation: Τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν. For so it follows immediately: Γένεσις ἐν ὑπαρχούσας τὸ θεῶν, &c. He Reasons upon it, not only as granted to those with whom he was then disputing, but as really *True*.

8.

It is also agreeable to those Heathen Originals from whence the Phrases of the N. T. concerning this matter are deriv'd.

Thus then it appears that this *Divine Spirit* entitled them who had it to a state of *Immortality*, in the opinion of those *Times* at least of Rewards. Yet even this *Divine Seed* was thought to be τρεπλὴς φύσεως, as such as might, by the ill use of their *Free Will*, not only deserve, but incur Punishment. And in that Case, if the *Punishment* was not limited to a certain time, it might be equal to their own duration, and therefore *Eternal* also. So it was supposed to be in the Case of *Saturn*. So in the Case of the *Titans*, and the *Rebel Giants*, condemned for their Wars against the *Gods*, who all were thought to be *Gods* on account of their *Divine Extraction*, So, in relation

to the Jewish Hellenists, in the Case of the Giants, which were born to the Sons of God by the Daughters of Men, and of these Sons of God themselves, who are called Angels by S. Jude, who are said to have left their own *δικταίον*, and to have fallen from their *ἀρχή*, the Dignity wherein they had been created, and are reckoned among *Fleshly Sinners*. So also in the Case of the first fallen Angel who tempted our first Parents long before that Defection that occasioned the Deluge. These were all *Pneumatical*, either *unmixt* as the Angels; or *mixt* as the Giants, who answered the Heathen Heroes or Semidei, being Divine, as they descended from the Sons of Seth, and purely Humane, as being born by the Daughters of Cain, who had no pretensions to this Divine Spirit. These are the *Spirits in Prison*, 1 S. Pet. iii. 19. As being in Prison, is the same with being bound, Act. xiii. 18. xxv. 14. xxvi. 29. So the Apostate Angels are said to be bound in the Book of Tobit and S. Peter, and the Apocryphal Book of Enoch and the Revelations. And that in Chains of Darknes. In them they are said to be reserved to the Judgment of the Great Day. The Book of Enoch seems also here alluded to, as also the Heathen Traditions of Saturn's being also bound, mention'd in Plutarch. The Book of Enoch mentions a Day wherein they were to be judged.

Judged. Then they are to be sentenced *Fire, to Flaming and Eternal Fire, to Tartarus, that nethermost Hell, the deepest of Hades, as it is described in Hesiod, from whom, and the like Heathen Poets, the Word is taken in the New Testament.* This was the place for *Immortal Criminals*, never mention'd as *intended for Ordinary Souls in the Poets*, from whose use the Word is taken. And the *New Testament* implies when it tells us that it was prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, who were all undoubtedly owned for *Spiritual*. That *Ordinary Humane Souls* should be *Spiritualized* and should be thereby entitled to *Eternal Punishments*, was a thing *unknown* before and was first notified by the *Revelations of the Gospel*. These *New Revelations* therefore declared that *God* had appointed the *Day*, which before they only thought probable by *Humane Reasonings*: and that those that heard the *Gospel* should be concerned in it, which none but those *Fallen Angels*, and the *Giants* their *Offspring*, were thought concern'd in before; and that they were understood to have taken the *Devil's* part, by *not* joyning with our *Blessed Lord* upon the publication of his *Pleasure*, requiring them to joyn *Him*, should be so *Spiritualized* as was requisite to entitle them to *Immortal Punishments*, should share those Punishments which were *not* prepar'd

them, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*,
 to whom they had joyned *themselves* in op-
 position to our *Lord*; and that our *Blessed*
Lord, whom they had provoked by joyning
 with his *Adversary*, was by God himself ap-
 pointed to be the *Judge* that should pass
 the Sentence, as well against his *Capital*
Enemies, as their *Accomplices*. Hence it is
 that our *Blessed Saviour* himself, in his Para-
 ble concerning his own *Marriage* with his
Church, sentences those who should come
 to it without the *Wedding Garment*, to be
 bound hand and foot, and cast into outer dark-
 ness, where there should be weeping and
 gnashing of teeth, S. *Matth.* xxii. 13. This
 seems plainly to intimate their sharing with
 the *Devils* in their *Punishment*, whose part
 they had espoused, by rejecting the *Gospel*
 when it was preached to them. The *binding*
 seems to be design'd in order to it. They
 were bound as the *Devils* were. And with
 the same design of casting them into the *Fire*,
 prepared for the *Devils*, as the *Three Chil-*
dren were bound when they were cast into
 the *Fiery Furnace*. They are therefore said
 to be chained, to shew the *Confinement* of
 the *Spiritual* Natures from that Freedom
 which their own Nature would allow them,
 if they had been left to it, and had not
 been chained. And the *Chains* are called
Regions of Darkness, to let us know that it
 is to the darkness of those *Sublunary* Re-
 gions,

The Distinction between

gions in opposition to the *Light* of the
 that are *Celestial*, to which they are
 posed in *Scripture*. These *Chains* there-
 suppose these Beings so *chained* to have
Heavenly and *Divine* Ingredient in the
Natural Constitution, which would have
 enabled them to aspire to the *Heavenly*
 gions of *Light*, if they had not been
*fin*ed to those *darker* Regions by the
Chains. Yet even these *Chains* do not
 fine them to the *Tartarus*, for which they
 were reserved. When our Saviour was
 possessing him who had the *Legion*,
Devils tell him of tormenting them by
 their *Time*, S. *Matth.* viii. 29. What
 meant by that, is explain'd in the
 Narrative by S. *Luke*, that it was, his
 ing them into the *Abyss*, S. *Luke* viii.
 That *Abyss* is the same mention'd in Ge-
 i. 2. where *Darkness* is said to be on
 face of the *Abyss*. So in the LXXII,
 the *Vulgar Latin*. So it answers the
Chaos, as that also includes *Tartarus*, as
 as others of the *infernal* Regions. And
 it seems to be the *outer darkness*, that
 another *darkness* upon the face of it.
 so the *Gnosticks* seem to have understood
 in their *Fragments*, at the end of *Clement*
Alexandrinus. This plainly supposes them
 not yet in that *darkness* which is design'd
 for their *Punishment* till the *time* appointed
 for it, the *Day of Judgment*. Their pre-

place therefore is the *Darkness* that is near-
 the *Heavens*, the Regions of *Light*.
 That therefore it is taken for a *Confinement*
 for them to be here, it shews that
 Heaven was the ἰδίον οἰκητήριον from which
 they fell, and the place proper for their
Spiritual Nature. And this the Scripture
 acknowledges when it stiles them πνεύ-
 ματα, though it is usually with the *Epi-*
 thet of ἀκάθαρα. When therefore *Humane*
Souls are made ἱσάγγελοι by the Addition
 of this *adscititious Spirit*, they are then
 qualified for this *higher degree of Punish-*
ment. And being so qualified, *Christ* judges
 fit, that they should share with them in
 having joined with them in their com-
 mon Rebellion against his Authority. But
 this could only concern those *Souls*, whose
 Nature had been exalted and improved by
 the Accession of this *adscititious Spirit*.
 II, Others were not ἱσάγγελοι in Nature, and
 therefore not so qualified to share in the
 punishment of *lapsed Angels*. Thus it ap-
 pears to me, that this Hypothesis is really
 more *Scriptural*, than any other advanced
 in Opposition to it, from the Consent of
 all *Antient Ages*.

But you oppose to it the *Principles*, you
 pleased to call *Catholick*, of the *Souls*
immortality. And I am very willing to be
 concluded by any *Principles* truly *Catho-*
 lic; yet I shall not confine you to that
Notion

9.
 This Do-
 ctrine is
 owned by
 S. Justin
 Martyr.

The Distinction between

Notion of Catholick, which belongs properly to the *Archetypal Church in Heaven*, as I think I have proved in my *Parænesis*. I am content with that *Consent of particular Churches*, which may be a solid *Argument* for proving a *Doctrine delivered from the Apostles*. But I must needs say, I do not think that the *Consent of all*, or the greatest part, of *particular Churches now*, at the distance we live in, from the *Apostles*, is such an *Argument*. The *Protestants* took many *Doctrines* as they found them, without examining them from *Originals*, with no use of them in the *Controversies* that were disputed, suggested any *Reasons* for trusting them. The two great *Bodies* the *Greeks* and the *Romanists* had for many of the *intermediate Ages*, allowed *new Revelations* since the *Apostles* times, and the *Credentials of Miracles*, for recommending them; and had agreed on so precarious *Proofs* of both kinds, as put it perfectly in their *Power* to introduce what *new Revelations* they pleased of *Doctrines unknown to the Apostles*, and to make their *Bodies unanimous* in them, by *Principles* received by both of them, and not concerned in their *Differences in Communion* from each other. Their *Agreement* therefore in any *Doctrine*, as received from the *Apostles*, can be no certain *Argument* to prove that it really was so, at least, since the

they have taken up, and agreed in, these *false Criteria*. If we allow of no *new Doctrinal Revelations*, but what were made to the *Apostles*, we can allow of no *Consent* of particular Churches, as an *Argument* to prove a *Doctrine* true, but such a *Consent* as could *not* possibly have been, unless the *Doctrine* had been *really* revealed to the *Apostles*, and been faithfully conveyed from them. This I am willing to be determined by as it is managed by *Tertullian* and *Vincentius Lirinensis*, but especially by *Tertullian*. The nearer the better, and the more impossible it was for *Bishops* to have been *unanimous* in a *Change* when they were equal, and none had Authority sufficient to oblige his *Colleagues* to change with him. Yet even here also I confess them *unanimous* in asserting the *actual* Survival of *Souls*, after the Dissolution of their Bodies. All I deny is, that they asserted them *Immortal* of their own *nature*, or that their continued Survival was for ever, without a new *Indulgence* of God, above what he had granted them at their *Creation*. Against this I oppose *S. Justin Martyr*. His good old Man, or *Genius* (in whose person he speaks what he himself believes true) blames *Plato* expressly for asserting your *Doctrine* of the *Soul's* *eternal Immortality*. He tells us expressly, in opposition to him; Οὐδὲ πλεὺς ἀθάνατον ἀλλ' αἰώνιον ὄντως. *Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 222.*

He gives this plain account of God's disposal of *Human Souls*: Αἱ μὲν αἷται τῷ θεῷ ῥέπει· ἐκ ἀποθήσκουσιν ἐπὶ αἱ δὲ κολάζονται· ἔστι δὲ αὐτὰς καὶ Εἶναι καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὁ δὲ θεὸς. p. 223. He makes their *Existence* as well as the *Duration* of their *Punishment* to depend on the *Divine* arbitrary *Pleasure*. So that the *Eternity* of the *Punishment* the *Wicked* themselves, how much soever contrary to their own *Desires*, is not (according to him) imputable to their *Nature* but God's Will that it should be so actually. So he had told us just before: Ἀλλὰ ἐδὲ ἀποθήσκειν φημι πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐρμαιον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς. Plainly implying, that though all *Souls* did not yet *some* did actually die, even according to his own *Opinion*, which must therefore have been exactly the same with that we think so hardly of. He accordingly applies what *Plato* in his *Timæus* says concerning the *World*, to this case of *Human Souls* and all other Beings distinct from God himself: Ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν καὶ φθαλὸς ἐστὶν ἢ γέρας καὶ λυθῆναι δὲ, ἐδὲ τεύξεσθαι θανάτου μετὰ τὸ βέλυσιν τῷ θεῷ; τίτ' αὐτὸ σοι δοκεῖ περὶ ΨΥΧΗΣ καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντων λέγεσθαι; ὅσα γὰρ ἔστι μετὰ τὸ θεόν, ἢ ποῖε, ταῦτα εἶσιν φθαλῶν ἔχειν, καὶ οἷα παρανοεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ εἶναι. Μόνον γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀφθαλὸς ὁ θεός, καὶ διὰ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα μετὰ τὸν γεννητὰ καὶ φθαλῶν.

Τὰς χάριν ἢ 'ΑΠΟΘΝΗ' ΣΚΟΥΣΙΝ
 Αἱ ΨΥΧΑΙ' ἢ καὶ ἀζώνται. It is particu-
 lar, with regard to *Human Sou's*, that the
Mortality he ascribes to them, is such as is
 not generally prevented by *God* himself; but
 may actually take place in those Cases
 wherein the *contrary Doctrine* is of the
*harsh*est Consequence, that of *unbaptized In-*
fan's, and of those who never heard of the
Gospel. And this *Mortality* is not meant
mystically, in reference to the *Enjoyment* of
God; but *literally*, as appears from the
 Places now transcribed, of a *ceasing to be*.
 He applies it expressly to their *Being*. And
 it is their *ceasing to be*, that he owns to be
 so *beneficial* to the *wicked*, as the *Scripture*
 also. So again; Ζῶς ὃ ψυχὴ μέλει,
 καὶ ζῆν αὐτὴν ὁ θεὸς βέλει. ἕως ἄρα ἢ ὅ
 μέλει πολὺ, ἔταν αὐτὴν μὴ βέλοι ζῆν. p. 224.
 But is not all, He ascribes this *Death* of
 the *Soul* to the same *Cause* as I have done,
 as *S. Paul*, the *Desertion* of it by the
Spirit. So it follows afterwards: As the
Soul dies when the *Soul* leaves the *Body*;
 καὶ ἔταν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν μετέπει ΕἶΝΑΙ,
 ἀπ' αὐτῆς τὸ ΖΩΤΙΚΟ'Ν ΠΝΕΥΜΑ,
 ἔταν ἢ ψυχὴ ἔτι, ἀλλὰ ἢ αὐτὴ ἔταν ἐλή-
 κειτε χωρὶς πάλιν. This ζῶτικόν πνεῦμα
 is the very same, and has the very same
 ascribed to it, as the πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν
 of *Paul*. So *S. Justin*.

II.
And by
Tatian.

The same also is the Doctrine of Disciple *Tatian*, a little after his Master's *Martyrdom*. His words are as plain to purpose, as those of his glorious Master.

ἐκ ἔσιν ἀθάνατοι, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, ἡ καὶ ἑαυτὴν, θνητὴ δέ. Ἀλλὰ δύναται ἡ τὴν καὶ μὴ ἀποθνήσκειν. Θνήσκει μὲν γὰρ καὶ τὰ μετὰ τὸ σῶματι, μὴ γινώσκουσα τὴν θείαν, ἀνίσταται δὲ εἰς ὕψος ὅτι συντελέσας νόμον σὺν τῷ σώματι θανάτου διὰ τιμὴν ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ λαμβάνουσα. Πάλιν τε ἐπὶ καὶ πρὸς καὶ λυθῇ, τὸ ὅτι γινώσκω τὸ πεποιημένη. *Orat. ad Græc.* § 21. *Ed. Ox.*

Withal he owns it due to the Spirit, that it does not actually die. So afterwards

Ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ τῷ πνεύματι ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη ὑπὸ αὐτῆς. § 22. Again : συζυγίαν τὴν τιμὴν τὸ τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα, ἐκ ἔσιν αὐτοῦτος. Ἀνίσταται δὲ πρὸς ἅπας αὐτὴν χάρις τὸ πνεῦμα. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὅτι τὸ οὐκ ἐστὶν. The σωτηρία is from the World; and the οὐκ ἐστὶν above is

same mentioned by S. Jude, as lost by fallen Angels. He makes the Desertion of the Spirit the Cause of this Death :

Πτὴν γὰρ ἡ τὴν ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ τέλειον ὅπερ ἀπὸ ῥήσασα, διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐπὶ ὥσπερ καὶ γὰρ χαμαιπετής ἐγένετο. §. 34. The Language here is that of Plato. He therefore

makes it the Duty of those who would recover the Conjunction with God, who Mankind has lost (for he had owned

first Man to have had it, §. 22.) to retrieve this Union with the Spirit ; *χρὴ λοιπὸν ἐμᾶς ὁππότε ἔχοντες ἀπολωλέκαμεν, τὸτο νῦν ἀναζητεῖν, ζευγνῶναι τε τῇ ψυχὴν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, καὶ τὴν κατὰ θεὸν συζυγίαν περὶμαρτυρεῖν.* § 24. And, as he ascribes our Salvation to this Communion with the Divine Spirit, so, on the contrary, he makes this κοινωνία with the Devil to entitle them, who are guilty of that κοινωνία, to share with the Devils in their Punishment. His words are ; *Καθάπερ ὅτι τῷ λησέοντι συνδεσπνήσας, καὶ μὴ λησὴς αὐτὸς ἦ, ἀλλ' ὁμῶς, διὰ τὸ συνεσπᾶσθαι, τιμωρίας μετ' αὐτὸν λαμβάνει* τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ μὴ κακός. τῷ ὅτι φαύλῳ ἀναμνηεῖς, πρὸς τὸ νομιζόμενον κακὸν συγχεσάμενος, διὰ τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν κοινωνίαν, ὑπὸ κρίνοντος τὸτον θεὸν κολαδιέσθαι. § 20. Thus far he agrees with his Master, and may therefore be more securely trusted, as faithful Witness of what was not contrary to Apostolical Tradition. His making the Souls, both of the Good and Evil, in the interval between the Death of their Bodies and their Resurrection, we may look on as his Human Reasonings, when he was now disposed to introduce his Heresie, which he did soon after his Master's Death. When he had less regard for truly Apostolical Tradition, and the true Catholick, which as a Witness of it.

12.
And St.
Irenæus.

S. Irenæus follows S. Justin Martyr, after whom he wrote, tho' he was born before him. He admits the Reasoning that S. Justin did, that whatever was *γεννητόν* must be *φθαρτόν*; And therefore allows nothing to be *ingenerable* and *incorruptible* but God. All other things therefore having had a *beginning*, he allows them no certain Duration, but according to the Pleasure of God: *Perseverant autem, & extenditur ad longitudinem Saculorum, secundum voluntatem factoris Dei*, l. i. c. 62. These Words are taken from the famous Passage of Plato in his *Timæus*, where the *Perpetuity* of Duration is expressly denied of them, on account of their Nature. He applies it to Souls and created Spirits themselves. And therefore adds concerning them also; *Perseverant autem quoadusque eas Deus & esse & perseverare voluerit*. Concerning our Life, he affirms; *Non ex nobis, neque ex nostrâ Naturâ vitæ sed secundum gratiam Dei datur*. He therefore subjoins, that he who is *ingrateful* owns not his Benefactor, *ipse se privat, sæculum sæculi perseverantia*. Afterwards he has these Words; *Capit & animas immum non existentes dehinc perseverare, eas Deus & esse & subsistere voluerit*. He uses the Reasonings, and almost the Words of S. Justin. Though the Reasoning is Plato's, and he may seem to proceed

the Platonick Hypothesis, in those very Particulars wherein S. Justin owns himself of a different Opinion from Plato. He may seem to reckon the Souls and Spirits in one Rank, as if the Soul's actual Immortality were no more precarious, than that of the Spirit, which is directly contrary to the Doctrine of S. Justin. He seems to make them also *naturâ immortalia*, quibus à sua naturâ adest vivere, l. v. c. 4. He denies that the Soul dies, l. v. c. 7. But it is upon a critical Notion of Death, as it signifies a ceasing to breathe, which cannot properly belong to any thing but the Body which is, alone, that which properly breaths. Again, v. 13. Οὐτε γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ θνήσκει, ἔτε τὸ πνεῦμα. But all he means by these Expressions, seems only to be, that the Soul does not actually die when the Body dies, and that, in its own Nature, it does not consist of contrary Principles, tending to a Dissolution by its own Nature, as the Body does. So it will not differ from S. Justin, but Tatian, as denying the actual Death, even of the Soul, though Death be indeed natural to it on account of its natural Constitution. And so himself seems to explain himself, when, speaking of this Immortality of the Soul and Spirit, he has these Words; per-
Warrant immortalia, quoniam vivificantur à
 re, l. v. c. 4. It is therefore the perse-
 ceedance in Life, when the Body dies, that

The Distinction between

he means by the *Soul's Immortality*. And it is the extrinſical *Favour* of the Father, not its own *Nature*, to which the Soul is beholden for that *perſeverance* in Being, according to the Opinion of St. Irenæus. But a perfect Man, according to him, as well as the *Apoſtle*, includes all Three. *Perfectus homo commixtio & adunitio est anime affumentis Spiritum Patris, & admixti ei carni, quæ est plasmata secundum imaginem Dei*, v. 6. Again: *Cum autem Spiritus commixtus anime unitur plasmati, propter fusionem Spiritus Spiritualis & perfectus homo factus est; & hic est qui secundum imaginem & similitudinem factus est Dei*. And man has in the ſame Place, to the ſame Purpose. As after c. 8. All three are, with him, eſſential to the ſpiritual Man, who is qualified to be a Member of the new *Peculiar*, whether he have extraordinary Gifts of Spirit or not: He cannot otherwiſe be Spirit, as well as one Body, with *Chriſt* Myſtical. Indeed, if he have not the Spirit of *Chriſt*, he can be none of his. But he does not believe all Men to have this Spirit. His Words are; *Si autem defuerit animæ Spiritus, Animalis est verè, qui talis, & carnalis derelictus imperfectus est imaginem quidem habens in plasmate, similitudinem verò non assumens per Spiritum*, v. 11. Nor did he believe that, without this Spirit, they could have *Spiritual Bodies*, which

might entitle them to *Immortality*, and the *Resurrection*. So afterwards; *Per Spiritum surgentia fiunt corpora Spiritualia, uti per Spiritum semper permanentem habeant vitam*, v. 7. Again; *Sic ergo pignus hoc habitans in nobis jam Spirituales efficit, & absorbetur mortale ab immortalitate*, c. 8, 9. It is endless to transcribe all his Places to this Purpose. His xii. Chap. is very considerable. He there makes a *Distinction* between the πνοὴ ζωῆς and the πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν in the Greek of *Genesis*. The πνοὴ ζωῆς, he says, makes a Man only ψυχικόν. For this *Flatus vitæ*, is with him the *anima* or ψυχή c. 7. This is all that he owns as given to all *Mankind*. So he observes from *Is. xlii. 5.* Ἐ μὲν πνοὴν παντὶ κοινῶς τῷ ἔθνει λαῷ φήσας δεδόται τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἰδίως καταπατῶσι τὰς γὰρ δαίμονες ἐπιθυμίας. This seems plainly to allude to the *Renunciation* of the *Lusts* of the *Flesh*, made in our *Christian Baptism*. Plainly therefore he does not allow all *Mankind* that Principle which can alone, in his Opinion, entitle them to the *Immortality* of their *Bodies*, and the *Resurrection*. Yet its being given as a *vital Principle* of the *new Life*, in our *Baptismal Regeneration* to that *new Life*, for our *Qualification* for *Immortal Rewards*, is very reconcilable with its *qualifying* those who have it in their *Power* to *qualifie themselves* for *eternal Rewards*, if

if themselves pleased. God's Pleasure, here alledged as the Reason why those things may be perpetuated, which, of their own Nature, can lay no claim to a Perpetuity of Duration. And it is again perfectly depending on his Pleasure, which he will perpetuate them to Punishment who, through their own Fault, have never received the Baptismal Immortalizing Spirit. He may assign them a Spirit that may only immortalize them. Or he may himself, if he pleases, perpetuate their Duration, without any subordinate Influence of any Spirit at all.

13.
And Athenagoras.

So also *Athenagoras* in his excellent Discourse concerning the Resurrection: ὃν, ὅν καὶ λόγον δεξάμεθα, ἔαν ἀνδρωπῶν. ψυχὴ καὶ ἐαυτῶν. Ἄνθρωποι ἄρα δεῖ τὰ ἀμφοτέρων ἐν ἑαυτοῖς διαμεῖναι εἰς αἰῶνα. Here all the three Parts already mentioned as requisite to the Perfect Man that may διαμεῖναι εἰς αἰῶνα. Only the Supreme and Noblest part of all, which the Scripture calls πνεῦμα, is here expressed in terms more received among the Heathen Philosophers, to whom the Author writes, of Νῆς and Λόγῳ. Both of them may be applied to the same thing in different respects, only Νῆς is the noble Appellation of the Two. The Humane Spirit is Λόγῳ, with relation to the Divine Spirit, that is, the Third Person in the Trinity. Yet it is Νῆς if compared with the

Humane Soul. And it is plainly *contradi-*
stinguished from the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\ \kappa\alpha\theta'\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\acute{\omega}$, as
 that which cannot make a *Man* with the
Soul alone, without the *Body*. This seems
 to allude to its title of the *Second Adam*,
 the *Man* from *Heaven*, which may deno-
 minate a $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$ that may be
 entitled to *Immortality* and the *Resurrection*.
 It therefore supposes a $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$, be-
 cause it is not *another Body*, but the *same*
changed (that is the *Apostles* word) and,
 by the *change* ennobled and exalted to a
 more excellent State, from that of being
Corruptible to *Incorruption*, and of being
Mortal to *Immortality*. This must have
 been this admirable Author's design, in or-
 der to prove the *Resurrection* of the *Body*.
 None, that I know, ever pretended that
 the *Soul*, which is *common* to all *Mankind*, to
 as alone sufficient for *immortalizing* the *Body*.
 But it was the *received* Opinion among
Christians, that the $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ or $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron$, as
 derived from *Christ* the *fontal* $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron$, added
 not to the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ alone, but to the $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \psi\upsilon$ -
 chical, was sufficient for it, to *change our*
Corruptible Bodies, and to *make them like his glo-*
rious Body, from whom, all *Men* (who could
 pretend a good Title) were, (by the *A-*
postle's Reasoning) to *derive* their Title to
Resurrection. At least this $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron$ is to
 give us a Title to have our *Bodies* raised by
 the *Christ*, as this makes us *one Spirit* with him,
 and

and consequently gives him a Title to Bodies as *animated* by his Spirit. He likewise proceeds on the same Principles in *Legation*. He there gives an account of the fall of the *Angels* by *Women*. So the Greek Interpreters call the *Sons of Seth*, Gen. He tells us therefore that these *Angels* come from *Heaven*, *οὐδὲ τ' ἀγγέλους ἔχοντες ἢ τὴν ἐκείνους εἰς τὰ ὑπερβάνια ὑπερῶσαι δύναμιν*. This is agreeable to what I have observed in my Discourse of *Marriages* according to the *Notions* of those *Times*. They being a *Pneumatical* Original have therefore next place to *Heaven* allowed them, with their forfeiture of the *Spirit*, and the *ῥύσις* following upon it (to speak in the Language of the *Platonists*) had disabled them for mounting thither again. But the *Souls* of the *Giants*, born of the *Daughters* of *Methuselah*, he says, are *οἱ περὶ κόσμον πλανώμενοι ἀστέρες*, the *ἀστέρες πλανῆται*, the *Authors* *πλανῆται*, that go to and fro in the *Earth*, in the style of the *Scriptures*, *πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν*, in that of *Hesiod*. These are of the *Earth*, and yet lower than the fallen *Angels*, as being of a *mixt* Nature: *Spiritual*, as being by their *Fathers* descended from *Seth*, and yet *Psychical* only as descended from the *Daughters* of *Cain*, who never had any pretensions to the *Spirit*.

14.
Theophilus Antiochenus
Theophilus Antiochenus.

Theophilus Antiochenus reckons Man neither Mortal nor Immortal of his own Nature.

ture, but capable of either state according to his own behaviour. His words are, Μέ-
 γας γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξέρχεται, ὅτε θνητὸς ὀλοχέρως,
 ὅτε ἀθάνατος τὸ καθόλου, δεκτικός. Ἥ ἐκατέ-
 ρον, L. ii. ad Autolyc. p. 101. Again, Ἀλλὰ
 φησὶ ἐν τῇς ἡμῖν, θνητὸς φύσει ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος,
 οὐδαμῶς. Τί ἐν, ἀθάνατος; Οὐδὲ τῆτο φα-
 μέν· ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις, ἐδὲν ἐν ἐγένετο, ἐδὲ τῆτο;
 ἐγὼ μὲν. [Perhaps ἐγὼμαι for ἐγὼ διμαι in
 the stile of *Dialogues*] Οὐτε ἐν φύσει θνητὸς
 ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἀθάνατος. Εἰ γὰρ ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν
 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπεποιήκει, θεὸν ἂν ἐπεποιήκει·
 πάλιν εἰ θνητὸν αὐτὸν πεποιήκει, ἐδόκει ἂν
 ὁ θεὸς αἰτιᾶσθαι τὸ θάνατον αὐτοῦ. Οὐτε ἐν
 ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν, ὅτε μὴν θνητὸν, ἀλ-
 λὰ καὶ ὡς περὶ τὸν θάνατον, δεκτικὸν ἀμφοτέρων·
 ὅτι τὰ τῇ ἀθανασίᾳ, τῇ θνήσκῃ τὴν ἐντο-
 λὴν τῷ θεῷ, μιᾶν κηρύσσει παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν
 ἀθανασίαν, καὶ γίνεσθαι θεός· εἰ δ' αὖτε τῇ
 θνήσκῃ τὸ θάνατον πράγματα, παρακίνας
 τὸν θεόν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ αἰτιᾶσθαι τὸ θάνατον.
 I have mended the Pointings for clearing
 the Sense. God's *not* being the Author of
 Death is from *Wisd.* i. 12, 13. as appears
 from the word ἐπεσπάσατο used by him a
 little after, which is the very word of that
 apocryphal Author. Our Promotion to a
 Divine Nature is likewise probably deri-
 ved from *Gen.* iii. 22. But it is warranted
 by the *New Testament*, and by other Au-
 thorities of the best and purest Ages, as I
 have long since shewn in my *Prolegom.* to
 my

my Tutor's Book *de Obſtinatione*. Accordingly his *Hypotheſis* is, That even *Corporal Death* was not deſigned for *Mankind* by any more than *Corporal Immortality*. That *Corporal Death* was not deſigned, he takes for granted from that place of *Wiſdom*. That *Corporal Immortality* was not deſigned he proves, becauſe God did not at firſt make *Man* a God. Meaning that lower notion of God which was conſiſtent with being made a God, ſuppoſing however even this lower Notion of being a God would have been ſufficient to have ſecured him from actual Mortality from which the Nature of that *Human Soul*, without the addition of that *Divinity* would not ſecure him. Otherwiſe God's making him no more than *Man* would have determin'd him to be mortal, contrary to the certain ſenſe of every ancient Author. This Reasoning therefore plainly ſuppoſes the *Human Soul* alone not ſufficient for *Immortality* without the acceſſion of this nobler *Divine Principle*; and that in conjunction with it, all three together are ſufficient: ſo that if God had made the whole ingredient in the Nature of *Mankind* he muſt have made it neceſſarily *Immortal*. And both theſe particulars are not only neceſſary Conſequences from his Reasoning, but perfectly agreeable to his Opinion. He before obſerved the Sacred Writers words concerning the Formation of *Man*, that God breathed

breathed into him *πνεῦν ζῶνς ἢ ἐξ ἐλεστο ὁ ἀν-*
θρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. 'Οθεν (says he)
ἀνάστα ἡ ψυχὴ ἀνθρώπου παρὰ τοῖς
 σοι. Implying plainly that he was
 himself of the number of the *many* who
 thought so. That appears from what I have
 said for him, and what I have said
 concerning the distinction of this *πνεῦν* &
 from the *πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν*, which was
 for the true *Principle of Immortality*,
 S. Irenæus. I cannot therefore easily
 believe that they were *Christians* who were
 meant by the *πλείονες* here mention'd. But
 who then (may you say) could they be
 who proved the *Immortality of the Soul* from
 nature? Perhaps the *Jewish Pharisees*,
 were the most *Popular Sect* among the
 Jews, and who defended the Being, not on-
 ly of *Angels*, but of *πνεύματα* distinct from
Angels, *Act. xxiii. 8.* Yet not so Critical as
 to distinguish between the *πνεῦν* and the
πνεῦμα, as S. Irenæus was, when they rea-
 soned from the *πνεῦμα* to the *πνεῦν*. Yet
 might, at *this time*, have been *Hea-*
then Philosophers, who, from the time of
Pythagoras and *Cronius*, and so downwards,
 admitted of the *Jewish Hypothesis* as con-
 sistent in the *Elective Sect* of *Philosophy*
 prevailing, which did not confine it
 to any one received Sect, nor even to
 the general consent of their *Heathen Masters*.
 considering the *Adversaries* with whom
 our

our Author deals in this *Work*, this indeed be the more *likely* Opinion. for the way how *Man* was to attain the *vine Principle* that was to make him a and, in consequence thereof, give him a to *Immortality*, and the *Resurrection* of *Body* also; he thus describes it. Μετὰ τὸ αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεγόνει, παράδεισον, διδὼς αὐτῷ ἀροσμήν ἀροσμήν, ἀύξάνων, ἢ τέλει. γινόμενος. ἔπειτα Θεὸς ἀναδειχθεὶς, ἔτις ἢ εἰς τὴν ἑρανὸν αὐτοῦ. Here it is plain, that (by his *Principle* the title to *Immortality*, and to ascend *Heaven*, could not otherwise be explained but by his ἀύξησις, his *Improvement* beyond what he had received at his first *Creation* which yet was all that his *Posterity* could claim from him, as bearing his εἰκόνα, descending from him. And what that *improvement* was, we may easily understand by the word he uses concerning it, οὐκ ἔτις ἀνὰ τέλει. That may indeed indicate *maturity* of *Age* in him who represents *Adam* as a *Child* at his first *Creation*. But they did not own any *Proficiency* in *Gods*, even in their *Gods* who were said to have a *beginning*. *Cupid* and *Mercury* in the *Heathen* Mythologies, are made to perform the Office of *Adults* as soon as they were born. The perfect *Man* therefore here is the same that is called for by S. Paul and S. Irenæus, and the other

of this Age, who is made so by the
 union of the Spirit to the other constitu-
 tions of Man at his first Creation, common
 to all who partake of the same Humane Na-
 ture. This was taken for the ultimate com-
 plement of the perfect Man, as that which
 made him perfect, as the Divine Nature
 which made him (in the stile of Theophi-
 st) a God, and therefore entitled him to
 Immortality, and the Heavenly οὐκίλησιον.
 To this purpose he has another subtle
 Mystical Observation on the passage of Ge-
 nesis: Ἐν τῇ Γένεσι γέγραπται ὡς δις αὐτῷ
 Παράδεισῳ τεθέντα ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἀπαξ
 πληρωμένον ποτὲ ἐτέθη τὸ δὲ δεύτερον
 πληρῶσαι μετὰ τῷ ἀνάσσειν καὶ
 τῷ ἀνάσσειν. Paradise, with the Mystical Inter-
 pretations, (and according to the design of
 himself, as he was pleased to signifie
 his mind by Mystical Symbols) was taken
 for a Symbol of Heaven. Accordingly the
 placing the Man in Paradise signified the
 conferring on him a Title to Heaven. These
 Mystical Expositors therefore make the Man,
 who was made of the dust of the Earth,
 to have been made in Paradise, but in
 Paradise out of the dust of which he was
 made. And that purposely, with this de-
 sign, that God might thereby signifie, that
 he had no title to Immortality and Hea-
 ven, but only on account of the Humane Na-
 ture he had received at his first Creation,

The Distinction between

and which was to be transmitted by him to his *Posterity*. Yet afterwards God was pleased to confer that further Honour upon him of the *Man from Heaven*, and *ἐκείνα*, which gave him a present title to *Paradise*, and thereby a Title in reference to *Heaven*, which was typified by *Paradise* as a *Covenanting Symbol*. This therefore entitled him to that *first Translation* into *Paradise*, which *Theophilus* observes as then performed by God immediately, in the *History of Genesis*. To this he was entitled on account of the *Spiritualizing* of his *Soul* by the union of the *Spirit* with it. The *remaining Translation*, mentioned by *Theophilus*, as expected after the *Resurrection* and *Judgment*, is plainly that of the *Body*, which that also was to be clothed with the *Spiritual Body*. Till then the *Body* could have no claim to *Immortality* or *Heaven*, or *Paradise* as a *Type of Heaven*. But this could not be expected till the coming of *Christ*, whose Office it is, to change our vile Bodies and to fashion them like his Glorious Body. By this whole Reasoning it appears, that neither *Soul* nor *Body* was then thought to have any Right to *Immortality* but by the *Spirit*. And that, upon account of the *Mystical Reasonings*, which were most generally received in the Age of the *Apostles* and in the *Writings* of the *New Testament*.

Tertullian is the most ancient of the *Latin* Fathers now extant. I mean, of them who wrote in *Latin*. He therefore is the best Witness we can expect of the Sense of the *Occidental Church*, in that early Age I am now concerned in. And he is of the same Opinion with his now mentioned approved Predecessors. He does indeed own the actual Immortality of the Soul, as we have seen the rest did, excepting *Tatian*. Especially of all who were, on that account, obliged to come over as *Profelytes* upon the Publication of the Gospel. And he had confuted the Opinion of *Hermogenes*, in a Book now lost, who took the Soul to be *suggestu materiæ*, de An. c. 1. This the *Cartesians* may perhaps take for an Argument of its natural Immortality, who think its Distinction from Matter, a sufficient Proof of its Independence on Matter, and consequently of its natural Immortality. But they can never prove that nothing but Modifications of Matter can depend on Matter, as to their Being and Preservation. Reasoning is far from being Self-evident. Nor was it ever (that I know of) proved by any before *Descartes*. How then *Tertullian* had such Opinions concerning the Soul, as are inconsistent with its Independence upon purer Matter, tho' it might survive the grosser Organical Body of our Visible Humanity. He plainly owns

14.
Tertullian
thought the
Soul ex-
traduce,
and there-
fore natu-
rally Mor-
tal.

our Souls now to be *ex traduce*, as *m*
begotten by the Souls, as our Bodies are
the Bodies of our immediate Parents
tells us that God made Adam's Soul *m*
cem omnium, and that all the variety
Humours that are in his Posterity, w
also have been in him, *ut in fonte natura*
si varietas natura fuisset, de An. c. 20.
makes it *Ingredient* in the Description
all our Souls, that they do *ex unâ re*
dare, c. 21. He gives it as his own
nion, *in utero concipi animam, cum*
figulatione compingi atque produci, c.
He makes the Soul to be introduced
mine, and *ex anima semine*, ib. He m
duas species seminis, corporalem & anim
indiscretas tamen— & hoc modo contemp
les, ejusdemque momenti. Again: In
ipso voluptatis ultima æstu quo genitale
expellitur, nonne aliquid de animâ q
sentimus exire, atque adeo marcescimus
vigescimus cum lucis detrimento? Hoc er
men animale protinus ex anime destillat
sicut & virus illud corporale semen ex
defecatione, Fidelissima primoraii ex
de limo caro in Adam. Quid aliud
quam liquor optimus? Inde erit genitale
ex adflatu Dei anima. Quid aliud ad
Dei, quàm vapor Spiritus? Inde erit qu
virus illud efflamus. Quum igitur in p
deo duo diversa atque divisa, limus &
unum hominem coegissent, confusa subsi

he jam in uno semina quoque sua miscuerunt,
 que exinde generi propagando formam tradi-
 unt, ut & nunc duo licet diversa, etiam
 pariter effluant, pariterque insinuata
 & arvo suo, pariter hominem ex utrâque
 substantia effruticent, in quo rursus semen
 insit secundum genus, sicut omni condi-
 ti genitali præstitutum est. Igitur ex uno
 semine tota hæc animarum redundantia agi-
 tatur, observante scilicet naturâ Dei edictum:
 Crescite, & in multitudinem proficite. Nam
 in ipsâ præfatione operis unius: Faciamus
 hominem, universa posteritas pluraliter præ-
 sentata est, & præsentantur piscibus maris. Nihil
 mirum, repromissio segetis in semine, c. 27.
 Item: Constitueramus animam in ipso, &
 in ipso feri homine, & unum esse à primordio
 animæ, sicut & carnis, in totum generis ex-
 tenditur, &c. c. 36. He adds, that the ani-
 ma is in utero seminata pariter cum carne.
 He owns the Difference of Sex in the Souls,
 as well as in the Bodies. He owns the Soul
 may have a Body, and plainly in another
 place from that wherein he ascribes Corpo-
 reity to God himself. He owns the same
 difference in the Powers of the Soul, as in the
 Bodies, though not in its Substance, for fear
 of Actual Mortality, c. 37. Such a Soul as
 is (though it might survive the gross
 material Body; yet) even Cartesians them-
 selves could not believe it independent on
 Matter in its own Nature. If therefore it

The Distinction between

be preserved from *actual Mortality*, it may be by the like Interposition of an extraordinary Providence, as that by which *Bodies* themselves are to be *immortalized* after the *Resurrection*. I know how severely this *Doctrine* is *censur'd*, by those who have more regard to the *Consent* of the *present Churches*, than the *Original Traditions* of the *Primitive Church*, with a unanimous *Consent* then, as can be pretended now. But it was *then* thought very reasonable with all that was *then* taken for *Apostolical Tradition*.

§ 5.
That Opinion of Tertullian, though generally deserted in the end of the 4th Century (when the Opinion that favoured the natural Immortality of the Soul began) yet was not, even then, condemned.

About the fourth Century, the *prelate's* Doctrine concerning the *Creation* of *Souls* seems to have begun; and in the *Sense* of *Creation*, is understood by the *Modern Schoolmen*. From that time the *Western Churches*, especially, have been pleased with that of *S. Augustin*, that *creando infunditur, infundendo creatur*. Yet even *S. Augustin* himself, who takes notice of this *Doctrine* of *Tertullian*, and that in his *Book de Resurrectionibus*, dares not however condemn it for *Heresy*. He confines the *Heresy* of *Tertullian* to his siding with the *Montanists*. No doubt, very well remembering, that the *Reconciliation* of the few remaining *Tertullianists* with the *Church* (which he mentions as performed within his own Memory) no other *Recantation* was exacted or expected from them, but only that

the Communion, and the Characteristical Doctrines, of the Montanists: So also Ruffin Apolog. ad Anastas. He mentions several late Disputes concerning the beginning of the Soul, and several Opinions then received concerning it. Among them this: *Quod pariter cum corpore per humani seminis traducem etiam anima diffundatur.* He adds: *Quod puto inter Latinos Tertullianum sensisse, vel Lactantium, fortassis & alios nonnullos.* But his own Opinion he durst not determine; *Usque ad præsens certi vel definiti aliquid de hac Quæstione non teneo, sed Deo relinquere quid sit in vero, & si cui ipsi revelare cognabitur.* And he gives this Reason of his Reservedness: *Adhuc ignorare confiteor præter hoc quod manifestè tradit Ecclesia: Deum esse & animarum & corporum conditorem.* This is all that was desired by the Church then. The Church had neither declared against this Doctrine of Tertullian, which supposed the Soul's natural Mortality, nor declared for the contrary Doctrine of natural Immortality, and its immediate Creation, which has since prevailed. For when this was one of the Opinions mentioned by him before, wherein he durst not be positive for this very Reason, because the Church had not as yet declared its Sense in favour of it. So in this Case he pleads for himself, when he was accused by S. Hierome of Heresie, for transla-

S. Hierom
ad Ruffin.
L. 11. L.
111.

Ep. 82. Ed.
Mar. Vi-
stor.

ting Origen's Books, *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*. And that in a Defence to Pope *Anastasius*, the first Bishop of the *Occidental Church*, upon that Acculation. Nor dares S. Hierom even in the hight of his *Resentment*, condemn *Ruffinus* for not condemning this Opinion in *Tertullian*, though himself was against it, and was unwilling to excuse *Ruffinus* for being so indifferent in the Matter. Yet even he is more favourable, when his Concern against *Ruffinus* was in some measure allay'd by the Death of his Adversary. Then he owns it, as not only the Sense of *Tertullian*, but of *Apollinaris*, and of the greatest part of the *Occidental Writers*, *Quomodo corpus ex corpore, sic anima nascitur ex animâ, & simili cum brutis animantibus conditione subsistat*. So he in his Epistle to *Marcellinus* and *Anapsychia*. This is the most invidious Consequence that can be inferred from this Doctrine of the *natural Mortality* of the Soul of Man, that it would be herein equal with the Souls of Beasts. Yet even this so warm a Man as S. Hierom durst not censure, even in an Age so distant from the Age of the Apostles, as that was wherein he wrote this, so long as the *Humane Soul* was, notwithstanding acknowledged secure from actual Mortality. Yet there are indeed very ancient Authors who compare lapsed Men with the Beasts that perish. And perhaps not without the

Author

Authority of that known Passage of the
Psalmist, *Pf. xlviii. 13. 21.* *St. Augustin*
 is almost as diffident of the true *Orig-*
ine of the *Soul* in Relation to the Opinion
 of *Tertullian*, in his *Ep. to Optatus*, as *Ruf-*
inus himself. And he takes notice of *S.*
Hierome's ascribing that same Opinion to
 the *Occidental Church*, without contradicting
 The thing that inclined the *Occidentals*
 to it then, was, that they thought it most
 reconcilable with the then newly defined
 Doctrine of *Original Sin*. So *Pelagius* had
 expected, as *S. Augustin* there observes :
anima ex traduce non est, sed sola caro tan-
quam habet traducem peccati ; sola ergo pœnam
ascenditur. Here then lay the Difficulty of
 both sides. On the one side, they could
 scarcely account how a *new created Spirit*
 could contract a *Contagion* of *Sin* from
 its *Origin*, without any *Traduction* of its *Being*
 from him. On the other side, they thought
 it likewise difficult to defend the *Immorta-*
lity of our *Souls*, if they were derived by
Traduction, not from God *immediately*, but
 from the *Souls* of our *immediate Forefa-*
thers. This made the zealous Defenders
 of *Original Sin*, wary of censuring this
 Doctrine of *Tertullian*, lest they should
 thereby drive them off from their *Communi-*
ty, who thought the Doctrine of *Orig-*
ine of *Sin* no way defensible without it. How-
 ever they would never have run into one
 Hereſie,

Heretie, for avoiding *another*. It is therefore plain, that they did not *then*, in the beginning of the fifth Century, when the *Pelagian* Disputes were started, believe the Doctrine of the Soul's natural Mortality *heretical*, so long as there was no *Question* made of its being *actually* Immortal.

Author of the *Dialogue*, under the Name of *S. Hierome* and *S. Augustin*, collected out of their own Works, gives us Names of several *others*, who joined this same Opinion with *Tertullian*. They are, *Apollonius*, *Pompeius*, *Arnobius*, *Constantinus* and *Apollinaris*. Of these, *Apollonius* was a little elder than *Tertullian*, and had confuted the *Montanists*, whom *Tertullian* defended against him. Thence it appears, that this Doctrine of *Traduction* was not even *then* proper to the Sect of *Manichæus*, nor condemned in him by the Catholic Church. *Apollonius* therefore is another Witness of this Doctrine in that Age.

16. As for *Tertullian*, as he is full, so he is not (that I can perceive) singular, if we consider his Age. He derives the Human Soul from the *Flatus Vitæ* in *Genesis*. *S. Irenæus* and others, both his Predecessors and Successors, did also, *de Anim.* c. 3. distinguish this *Flatus* or *πνεῦμα*, from *ritus* or *πνεῦμα*, as expressly as the same *Irenæus*, and from the same Passage *Is.* xlii 5. from whence it is proved *S.*

Tertullian is also otherwise very full in asserting the natural Mortality of the Soul, and in deriving its actual Immortality from the Spirit.

Irenæus and Theophilus. So Tertullian,
 c. 11. He does as plainly make this Spirit
 immutational, not common to all Mankind, as
 the Flatus was. *Neque Dei, neque Diaboli*
Spiritus ex nativitate conferitur animæ, ib.
 Though he makes the Soul the same with
 the Spirit in another Notion of the same
 word, as it signifies that by which we
 breath, c. 10. He gives the Soul a Body,
 and a Shape, as well as St. Irenæus. Nor
 does he doubt, any more than he, but that
 the Spirit is the only solid Ground for the
 Claim of Immortality. As for proper Im-
 mortality, he allows it only to that which is
 Innatum and Insectum, that is, ἀθάνατον and
 ἐνσώματον, in the Language of the Greek
 Philosophers, and therefore confines it to
 God alone, c. 21. And therefore he can
 allow no other Immortality but of Grace, to
 any created Beings. For this is the known
 Language and Principles, and Reasoning of
 Plato in his *Timæus*, and the generality of
 those who use these Terms, and must be
 understood accordingly. What therefore
 was made, and had a Beginning, if it have
 not an End, it cannot, in this way of Rea-
 soning, be imputable to its own Nature, but
 to the Arbitrary Pleasure of God. In this
 therefore Tertullian professes himself of an-
 other Mind from Plato, who thought the
 Soul Innatam. On which Concession, Ter-
 tullian reasons thus : *Adjicit immortalem,*
incor-

The Distinction between

incompactibilem, incorporalem (quia hoc & Deo credidit) invisibilem, ineffigibilem, uniformem, principalem, rationalem, intellectualem. Quod amplius proscriberet animam, si eam Deo nuncuparet? Nos autem qui nihil Deo appendimus, hoc ipso animam longe infra Deum pendimus, quod natam eam agnoscimus, ac hoc dilutioris Divinitatis, exilioris felicitatis, ut flatum, non ut Spiritum. Et, si immortalem, ut hoc sit Divinitatis; tamen passibilem, ut hoc sit nativitatis: ideoque & a periculo exorbitationis capacem, & inde etiam oblivionis affinem, c. 24. Immortality in this Reasoning, is taken for an Attribute proper to God. And therefore the Immortality that agrees to a more dilute Divinity, to a Being far inferior to God (such he makes that which he ascribes to the Humane Soul) must be a more dilute Immortality, and inferior to that which properly agrees to God. What can that be but a precarious Immortality, and perfectly depending on the Divine Favour? Plainly he owns it inferior to what it might have been expected, if the Soul, that is invested with it, had been the same with the Divine Spirit. Yet he ascribes all the Right the Body has to the Resurrection, to the Spiritual Body with which the Animal Body is then re-invested, which also is called Spiritual from the Spirit, then to be received by it, Res. Carn. c. 53.

Origen's private *Opinions* are rather favourable to that side of the Question, that magnifies the Nature of the *Humane Soul* beyond the Bounds of *Truth* and *Catholick Tradition*. That Consideration would, to be sure, have made him inclinable to take the uttermost Advantage true *Tradition* could have afforded him, against the *natural Mortality* of the *Soul*, and in favour of that *Divine Nature* of the *Flatus*, which with the *Spirit*, is its only security against *Actual Mortality*. This is sufficient to secure his Testimonies of this kind from any Suspicion of the *Errors* and *Paradoxes*, with which his Doctrine has been charged, in the Disputes and Judicial Sentences given against him. In this Case his *Concomitant* for the contrary, makes his Authority more worthy of Regard, than it would have been if he had been less concerned. Yet even he could find no Pretence of *Apostolical Tradition*, or Consent of the *Catholick Church* in his time, against the now mentioned Opinion of *Tertullian* concerning the *Soul's* being *ex traduce*, which supposes, though not its *actual*, yet its *natural Mortality*. His Words are very plain to his Purpose, in his Preface to his famous work *περί Ἀρχῶν*. *De anima verò utrum ex semine traducis ducatur, ita ut ratio ipsius substantia inserta ipsis seminibus corpora- tus habeatur, an verò aliud habeat initium: & hoc*

17.

Origen knew no Tradition of the Church in his Age against that Opinion of Tertullian, though himself differed greatly from it. No, nor Pamphilus nor Eusebius.

& hoc ipsum initium, si genitum est, an
 genitum: vel certè si intrinsecus corpori in
 tur, necne, non satis manifestâ prædicatione
 distinguitur. The Prædication here men
 tioned, is the same with that which
 had before called the *Ecclesiastica Prædicatione*
per successionis ordinem ab Apostolis tradita
 & usque ad præsens in Ecclesiâ permanens.
 That he makes the Rule within which
 designed to confine his future Disputes
 signed in this Work, very piously and pr
 dently. He was wary of giving want
 Wits a Precedent for calling any thing
 Question, that might any way affect the
 Doctrines wherein the Catholick Church
 that Age was agreed, as derived from the
 Apostles. This therefore shews that
 was very secure that Catholick Tradition had
 determined nothing contrary to this Do
 ctrine, which would, in the Consequence
 make the Soul naturally Mortal. Pamphilus
 in his Apology for Origen, has more Testi
 monies of the same kind out of other Pa
 sages of his Works, by which we know that
 this Acknowledgment was the Result of
 Origen's most deliberate and sedate
 Thoughts. Pamphilus also, in repeating
 these Assertions of Origen with Approbation,
 shews, that even his own Age was
 ignorant of any Apostolical Tradition inco
 sistent with this Doctrine, as that of Origen.
 Yet he is aware of the Consequence, that,

the Soul should be *ex traduce*, it must be mortal: So he reasons: *Sed & illud quod sequitur, quod perabsurdum est incurrere, non evadent, quia necesse est eam simul cum corpore mori, & esse mortalem si simul cum corpore vel seminata, vel formata, vel nata est.* This is actual Mortality that he proves would be the Consequence, as appears by the Argument he afterwards insists on. This therefore is that he takes here for on Absurdity, and afterwards for contradictory to the true Truth. So Pamphilus also will be another Witness for us. S. Hierome makes Eusebius the Author of that *Apology* ascribed to Pamphilus by Ruffinus. And he does so in a Design of overthrowing the Credit of Ruffinus. But I see no Reason why it should not have been written by both of them. And, if so, we shall then have two Testimonies more confirming that of Origen, and carrying it lower than he did, that, in the beginning of the fourth Century, there was yet no consentient Tradition of the Catholick Church against this Opinion.

S. Cyprian's Thoughts concerning our first and second Nativity, may be learn'd from these Words of his Epistle to Pompeius. *Porro autem non per manus impositionem nascitur quando accipit Spiritum sanctum, sed in Baptismo; ut Spiritum jam natus accipiat, sicut in primo homine Adam factum est. Et tunc in-*

sufflavit

18.
S. Cyprian
owns the
same Distinction
between our
first Birth,
by which we
receive our
Souls; and
the second
by which we
receive the
Spirit.

sufflavit in faciem ejus flatus vitæ. enim potest accipi Spiritus, nisi prius fuerit qui accipiat. To which may be added those other Words of his in his Epistle *Fidus*, concerning the Baptism of Infants *Prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ per Nativitatem contraxit.* Qui ad remissionem peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accipit quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata. The first Nativity of Adam is Plasmation, as he calls it, out of the Earth of the Earth. This was that which was capable of receiving the first Life from the Flatus Vitæ. That Flatus Vitæ in St. Irenæus's Master, Tertullian, is the πνεῦμα ὑπὸ τῷ ὕδατι, as the Apostle himself observes from the Passage in Genesis. This we receive from Adam, and by receiving this alone, we are reckoned carnaliter nati secundum Adam, as descending from the Flesh of Adam, and in Opposition to the Spiritual Nativity in Baptism, as Flesh and Spirit are opposed in the Reasonings of the Sacred Writers. By this it is said, *contagium mortis antiquæ contraxit.* Exactly answering the Reasoning of the Apostle, that reckons us in Adam, when we have no more than this living State which we receive from Adam; and reckons withal this State of Being in Adam.

as a state of *Mortality*, because this *living Soul*, which we have as descending from Adam, is not *alone* sufficient to secure us from that *actual Mortality*, to which he was condemned immediately upon his *fall*. This is that *mors antiqua*, in allusion to the *old Man*, and the *first Adam*, mentioned by Paul, and in *opposition* to the *Second Death* in the *Revelations*, from the *new* and *eternal Life*. The *second Birth* therefore makes in *Baptism*, and the *second Life* is by him ascribed to the *Spirit* given after *Baptism*, by the *Imposition* of the hands of the *Bishop*. This therefore, as *stopping* that *Contagion* of the *old Death*, must needs be taken for a *Principle* of *Immortality*. And it is plainly a *preternatural Principle*, as being *distinct* from that by which *Adam* became a *living Soul*. However, as it is a *Principle* of a *new* and *immortal Life*, S. Cyprian uses the word *animitari*, concerning the *Holy Ghost* himself. In *novam vitam lavacro aquæ salutaris immatus*. And again : *Terrenum fuisse, quod carnaliter natus delictis obnoxium vivebat ; Dei esse cæpisse, quod jam Spiritus Sanctus animaret*. He speaks this of his *new baptismal State* ; *Postquam cælitus Spiritus descendit, in novum me hominem Nativitas secunda reparavit*. This is the *Man* from *Heaven*, in the language of the *Apostle*, and *Plato*. By this therefore the *Apostle*

intimates, That, though this *adventitious Nature* did not belong to the Constitution of *Humane Nature* at its first Creation, yet it did to the Constitution of that Man, which the *Christians* of that and the former Age call'd the perfect and spiritual Man.

19.
 Arnobius
 owns our
 Souls Mortal in their
 own Nature, and
 Immortal
 only by the
 Spirit.

Arnobius has his Paradoxes on this Subject, for which himself alone is responsible. And his Case is the more excusable, considering that he was but a *Catechumen* when he wrote his *Book*, and was not thoroughly instructed in the *Christian Doctrine*. But he is more to be regarded when he speaks conformably to the sense of other *Catholic Doctors* of that early Age. So he does when he confutes *Plato* for making the *Humane Souls* the Offspring of God, and *Immortal* in such a sense, as those Beings, which were so, were reputed, on that very account, of their being of a *Divine Origin*. This *Tertullian* had done before him, as we have already observed. This he does frequently, through a great part of his second Book. Neither he therefore, nor the others, who reasoned as he did, could understand the passage of *Aratus* approved by *S. Paul*, of all Souls in general, but of the capacity all those were in of being immortaliz'd who heard the Gospel. And even the *Immortality* of such Beings proves not *Natural* but perfectly depending on the *Divine Pleasure* from the

His words of *Plato* in his *Timæus*. He
 takes therefore their *Longevity* (that's
 word) *summi principis munus ac benefi-*
um, p. 65. He blames the *Platonists* for
 neglecting the *πέρωσις* at their deaths. On
 the contrary, he delivers his own Opinion
 as: *Nos nobis nihil de nostrâ infirmitate*
mittimus, Naturam intuentes nostram vi-
am esse nullarum, p. 66. Again: *Nos tan-*
quam reformidamus audaciam, nec in nostrâ
imimus esse positum potestate, sedes superas
re; cum & hoc ipsum habeamus incertum,
vitam accipere mereamur, & ab lege mor-
talis abduci, ib. *Sed immortales perhiben-*
Dii esse. Non ergo Natura, sed volun-
tas Dei patris ac munere. Quo igitur pacto
immortalitas largitoris est Donum DEI circa
animas, [This is from the language of
 these Philosophers by whose example the
 Stoicks call'd their *Æons* *αἰετὰς*] &
animas hoc pacto dignabitur immortalitate do-
vere, quamvis eas mors sæva posse videatur
vincere, & ad nihilum redactas irreme-
di abolitione delere, p. 68. Then he
 gives his Doctrine concerning their Gods,
 in *Plato's Timæus*, ib. & p. 87. He again
 makes it the Prerogative of God alone to
 make Souls Immortal: *cui soli potestas est*
a corruptione exclusa largiri, p. 79. And
 very frequently owns it for his own O-
 pinion, That the Souls of Men are of a
 middle Nature between Mortality and Im-

mortality, and capable of either, as God pleased to allot it to them, herein agree with *Theophilus Antiochenus*. So p. 52. *Si enim mediæ qualitatis sicut Christo autem compertum est, & interire quæ possint, Deum si ignoraverint; vitæ & ab exitio liberari si adejus se minas atque indulgentias applicaverint.* So again, p. 65, 67, 79. And he grants this, not only of *Humane Souls*, but of other Beings whatsoever, excepting only the Supreme: *Omnes omnino, quos esse creatura suspicatur, Dii, Angeli, Dæmones, & nomine quocunque sunt alio, qualitatis & sunt mediæ, & in ambiguae sortis conditione relictæ, p. 67.* Accordingly, he makes *annihilation* (though a tedious one, and therefore with a more exquisite torment) to be the Punishment of the Damned. So p. 86. *Illa quæ sub oculis cernitur, animarum ex corporibus dijugatio, non finis obolitionis est, tremus. Hæc, inquam, est hominis poena vera, cum animæ nescientes Deum per longissimi temporis cruciatum consumentur igni in quem illas jacent quidam crudeliter & ante Christum incogniti, & ab solo scilicet detecti, p. 86.* *Res vestra in ancipiti sita salus, dico, animarum vestrarum, & nisi applicatis Dei principis notioni, à corporibus vinculis exolutos expectat mors sæva, & repentinam afferens extinctionem, sed per longum temporis cruciabilis pænæ acerbior consumens.* He therefore did not believe

any *Humane Souls* actually immortalized besides those of the good. And, in *their Case*, ascribes their *Immortality* to God's Pleasure in giving them his *Spirit*. So p. 87. *servare animas alius, nisi Deus Omnipotens, non potest : nec præterea quisquam est, qui ævæ facere, perpetuitatis possit & SPIRITUM subrogare, nisi qui immortalis & æternus solus est, & nullius temporis circumscriptio finitus.* Ev'n he, who makes all other Beings, besides the Supreme, *natural-Mortal*: and, if *Immortal*, yet only so *preparatoriously*: does notwithstanding own this *Divine Spirit* so *Immortal* in it *self*, as withal to be a *Principle of Immortality* to those *Human Souls* to which God is pleased to impart it. Yet he concerns *Christ* also in giving this *Spirit*. So p. 89. *Unius Pontificum Christi est, dare animis salutem, & SPIRITUM perpetuitatis apponere.* As granted to him by the Father, as *Arnobius* himself had observed before. This is the reason why the *Spirit*, though it be said to proceed from the *Father*, is notwithstanding call'd the *Spirit of Christ* by the sacred Writers themselves. Allowing therefore for the *Paradoxes of Arnobius*; yet he is full, and not without *Authority* of those who understood the *Christian Religion* better than he did, in the two principal *Assertions* for which I am concerned at present: That of the *Soul's Mortality* by *Nature*,

ture, and that it's actual Immortality was owned as received from the Spirit.

20. *Lactantius* takes some liberty as well
 So also *Lactantius*. his Master *Arnobius*. But in the main, Opinion seems to have been the same with the eminent Persons now mentioned. *Lactantius* also takes Man to be of a middle Nature, capable of Immortality as a reward of good behaviour ; otherwise Mortal, if he did not answer expectation. God, he says, made them *inter bonum malumque medias, constantibus ex utrisque naturis virtutem properaret, ne immortalitatem delicate assequerentur ac molliter, sed ad illud æternæ vitæ inextinguibile præmium summâ cum difficultate magnis laboribus pervenirent*, Instit. vii. Again, *Nam quia homo ex duabus rebus constat, corpore atque animâ, quorum alterum terrenum est, alterum cæleste ; duæ vitæ homini attributæ sunt : una temporalis, quæ corpori assignatur ; altera sempiterna, quæ animæ subest. Illam nascendo accepimus, hanc assequimur laborando ; ne immortalitas, (ut ante diximus) sine ullâ difficultate constaret*. And he expressly denies this Immortality to be the effect of Nature. So afterwards : *Virtuti enim, non Naturæ, datur ; quia voluit nos Deus vitam nobis in vitâ comparare*. Again : *Nam non interesset inter justum & injustum ; si quidem omnis homo natus immortalis fieret. Ergo non immortalitas non sequela Naturæ, sed mercedis præmiumque virtutis est*. He not only denies

this, but owns our title to *Immortality* as derived from our *Baptism*, and our *Baptismal Spirit* which we there receive. His words are very remarkable to this purpose : *quæ ratio docet, mortalem nasci hominem ; istea verò immortalem fieri, cum cæperit ex eo vivere, id est, justitiam sequi ; quæ consequetur in Dei cultu ; cum excitaverit hominem Deus ad aspectum cæli ac suû. Quod tum cum homo cælesti lavacro purificatus, exiit infantiam cum omni labe vitæ prioris ; incremento Divini vigoris accepto, fit homo perfectus ac plenus.* This perfect Man, in the style of the *Apostle* and *St. Irenæus*, is who has the *Divine Spirit* received in our *Saviour's Regenerating Baptism*, which therefore must be the *Principle of Immortality* here mentioned. This is the *Spirit* which, *Lactantius* says, God puts into a *terrene Body*, and which he calls *sempiternum*, *ib. 12.* and *æternum*, *ib. è cælo & à Deo, 12. vii. 4, 5. ii. 11. ex Deo, 12. à Deo inspiratam, vii. 12.* which he calls *animam : dicto corpore spiravit ei animam de vitali fonte spiritûs sui, qui est perennis.* Which, he makes *immortal*, if it be victorious : *ut si anima perseveraverit, quæ ex Deo oritur, sit immortalis, in perpetuâ luce versetur.* And *L. iii. 2.* he says the same of the *Human Spirit*. But he cannot mean it to be so *naturally*, if it be so no otherwise than *conditionally*. He has withal a clear notion of *Soul*, as distinct

from the Spirit, so distinctly and independently subsistent, as that being actually separated, one will be a Principle of Mortality, the other of Immortality, to him that has them. So L. vii. c. 5. *Cum posset semper spiritibus suis immortalibus innumerabiles animas procreare, sicut angelos genuit, quibus immortalitas sine ullo malorum periculo ac metu constat : excogitavit tamen inenarrabile opus, quemadmodum infinitam multitudinem crearet animarum, quas primo fragilibus et imbecillis corporibus illigatas, constitueret inter bonum malumque medias ; ut constantibus ex utrisque naturis virtutem proponeret ; immortalitatem delicatè assequerentur ac mollioribus ; sed ad illud æternæ vitæ ineloquibile præmium summâ cum difficultate ac magnis laboribus pervenirent.* The way therefore, according to Lactantius, taken by Providence, for making Man's actual Mortality or Immortality the Reward or Punishment of his Free will, was to join his Soul to his Body immediately ; which being it self Frail and Mortal, cou'd not secure the Soul from actual Mortality. This he supposes would make the Complex of the Soul and Body actually Mortal. But this Reasoning could not hold, unless he had believed the Soul Naturally Mortal as well as the Body. Otherwise the Nature of the Soul alone had been sufficient for its own preservation from actual Mortality, though the Body had contributed

ed nothing to it. But he supposes that
 the State of *Man Mortal*, and that the
 Union of the *Spirit* to both made both
 mortal. He makes the Body *immorta-*
lis experts, and makes that *Happiness*,
 which the *Philosophers* ascribed *non corpori*,
animi, to have relation only *ad hanc vi-*
quæ cum corpore terminatur, L. iii. c. 12.
 ar he is from owning the *Immortality*
 his Soul, in contradistinction to the *Sp-*
as natural to it, that he seems to own
ctual Death, for the space between the
 of the *Body* and the *Resurrection*. He
 fore ascribes the *Resurrection* to the
 as well as the *Body*. His words are
 : *Et quia temporalem vitam temporalis*
sequitur ; consequens est, ut resurgant
ad vitam perennem ; quia finem mors
alis accepit, L. vii. c. 10. *Servatus*
 us is here mistaken, when he takes
 for an *Impropriety of Speech*, which is,
 with, a *real Consequence* from the *Prin-*
 of *Lactantius*. Yet he denied the
 tion of the *Souls* from the *Human*
 ts, *de Opific. Dei*, c. 19. but makes them
 immediate work of *God* himself, and ob-
 the passages even of *Lucretius*, to
 purpose. In this he differs from the
 ne of *Tertullian*, who thought only
 soul of *Adam* produced by *God*, but
 the other *Souls* descended from *his*, by
 olifick *Virtue* given by the words, *in-*
crease

crease and multiply, as our Bodies are derived from *his Body*. Which form of Speech though it could not be used by *Lactantius* concerning *Human Souls*; yet it is, with his *Principles* would allow of it, in relation to the *Human Body*. In that regard owns only *one Man* formed by God, L. c. 4. Herein therefore *Lactantius* also seems to have imitated *Tatian* in owning the Mortality of the *Soul*, though only for a short a time. But, as for the *wicked* differed from the Opinion of his Master *nobius*. He does not allow them the benefit of a *Punishment* that might, at length annihilate them, though with very tedious as well as very exquisite, Tortures. *Lactantius*, on the contrary, makes that *Punishment* *Eternal*. So L. ii. c. 12. concerning *Death* of the *wicked*, he says, *Cujus non est, ut injustas animas extinguat omnino, ut puniat in aeternum*. Yet *Lactantius* gives a Title of our *Souls* to *Immortality*, on account, of their being a *Divine Offspring*. So he calls even *those* of them who *misuse* *animas ad cœlestia genitas*, L. vii. c. 6. that can only signify their being the best *Candidates* for the *Divine Favours* finitely; not any *immediate* claim to a particular one of *Immortality*. And being *Genitæ* is alone sufficient to overturn their Title to it, on account of their *Nature*. Yet that is the word used by

the former Chapter for expressing the
 Original of *Human Souls* in general. If he
 not declared against *Traduction* in the
 former Work now mention'd, this word
 'd have tempted one to suspect, that
 had in earnest favoured *that* Original of
Soul. But take the word in a *less* re-
 ned sense, it will however either prove,
 consistent with, a *precarious Immorta-*

With the *Platonists*, that could be no
 wise *Immortal* that was γενντόν as that
 signified a *begotten*, or γενντόν as that signi-
 fied a *factitious Being*. And, even by our
 Reasonings, it will at least, not im-
 ply necessity of an *Immortality* by Na-

Even *Lactantius* himself owned that
 first Man was made by God, as to both
 that of his *Body*, as well as of his

Yet he did not therefore make him
 mortal. But having here declared for
Immortality depending on Man's own
 nature, *Lactantius* cou'd not mean the
 Soul and *Immortality*, to which he makes
 Soul born, as due to it on account
 of its own *Nature*. By the *Soul* therefore
 he also elsewhere calls *Spirit*, iii. 12.
 means the *Flatus*, or πνοή, which was
 inferior created Being. And by the
 in the *contradistinct* sense, that much
 Divine Being, which is the *Principle*
 of *Immortality*. Yet he sometimes ascribes
 it to it, not without *Authority*, as
 this

this also is an Ingredient in the perfect full Man, who can claim a place in πλήρωμα, as being himself the Archetypal Ideal Man.

21.

St. Athanasius owns the Natural Mortality of the Soul, & ascribes its Actual Immortality to the Spirit received from the λόγος.

I have now brought the Tradition down to the fourth Century. I shall only add more ; but as great and generally received a Standard of Orthodoxy, as any one I know of in that distance from the Apostles, this very Day : That is, the great Athanasius. He does indeed own the Doctrine of the Soul's Immortality, as a Doctrine of the Church. His words are plain : "ὅτι ἡ ἀθάνατος ψυχή, ἡ τῆς τοῦ καίου εἰδέναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ διδασκῇ." Orat. cont. Gent. p. 35. Nor does any of my present Cause oblige me to question his Truth in saying so. My present dispute is only whether that same Doctrine of the Church of his Age believed it mortal of its own Nature. And that the Church did not so believe it immortal, at least that Athanasius did not think that was the Doctrine of the Church in that Age. I think I shall not need a fuller Witness than his own. I know no reason to doubt but that he believed himself as he knew the Church did, in whose Cause he was so long a Champion, and so glorious a Champion. And he himself seems very plain, in the Case of its Natural Mortality. He says Mankind ἔχει ἱκανὸν κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον γένος

διαμένειν αἰεί. de Incarn. verb. p. 56.
 accordingly he ascribes all the Hopes of
 Mortality in Man, rather than other Ani-
 mals, to that which is peculiar in him,
 which no other Earthly Animal can
 extend to, which the Scripture calls the
 Image of God, the ὁ καὶ εἰκόνα ἀνδρωπῶν,
 Philo and the Fathers call it, as derived
 from the Λόγος, who is himself the εἰκὼν
 of the Father. By him God the Father is
 secured to secure Mankind from that actual
 Mortality, to which otherwise the frail Ma-
 n of his natural Constitution would
 have been obnoxious: μεταδὲς αὐτοῖς ἡ δὲ
 λόγος δυνάμει· ἵνα ὥσπερ σκιάς τινος
 τῆς λόγος ἡ γενόμενοι λογικοί, διαμένειν
 ἀκαρτέτητι δυνήσῃσι, ζῶντες τὸ ἀληθινόν
 τὸ αἰώνιον ἐν Παράδεισῳ βίον. This
 Life in Paradise had given him, if
 he had persisted in it, a farther Title to an
 eternal State of Happiness in Heaven, of
 which Paradise was only a Covenanting
 School; but revocable by his Misbehaviour,
 which depended on his own Free-will.
 Therefore was to be fixed as far as was
 consistent with its Nature. And the way
 by God for fixing it, was by the Law
 concerning the Forbidden Fruit,
 Conditions whereof are thus expressed
 in Gen. 2: 17: ἵνα εἰ μὲν φυλάξαιεν τὸ χάρειν, ἡ
 καλοί, ἔχουσι τὸ ἐν Παράδεισῳ ἀλυστον
 ζῶντον ἡ ἀμέλεινον ζῶντον, πρὸς τὸ ἡ δὲ

ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἀρδαρσίας αὐτὰς τὸ ἐπαγγελίαν
 εἰ δὲ παρὰβῶν καὶ σφαμέντες γένοντο παρὰ
 γνώσκουσιν ἑαυτὰς τὸ ἐν θανάτῳ κατὰ
 φθορὰν ὑπομένειν, καὶ μηκέτι μὲν ἐν Παρὰ
 ζῶν, ἔξω δὲ τέττα λοιπὸν ἀποθνήσκουσας μένειν
 τὰ θανάτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ. Thus far
 supposes us only enabled to be *immortal*
 we please, but still supposes *Death* and
ruption most agreeable to our own Nature
 if deserted by the *Divine Favour*, notwithstanding the *Divine Breathing*, which
 the *Image of God*. Accordingly he
 pounds the *Divine Threat*, θανάτῳ ἀπο
 νεῖδε, in case they should break the Law
 against the Forbidden Fruit, that it may
 μὴ μόνον ἀποθνήσκουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ τῷ
 νάτῳ φθορᾷ μένειν. And he makes this
 Event when they had broken it : ἡ
 βασίς τὸ ἐντολῆς εἰς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν αὐτὰς
 σφύρειν, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐκ ὄντος γένοντασιν, ἔτι
 τὸ εἰς τὸ εἶναι φθορὰν ὑπομένωσι τὰ
 p. 57. And he gives this Account of the
 Agreeableness of the *Punishment* to the
Crime committed in the Fall : Εἰς
 Εἰ γὰρ φύσιν ἔχοντες τὸ μὴ εἶναι ποτε τῇ τῷ
 παρσία καὶ φιλανθρωπία εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἐκ λυ
 ἀγλαδον ἦν κενωθέντας τὰς ἀνθρώπων
 δεῖς ἐννοίας καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐκ ὅλα ἀποσφαμέν
 κενωθῆναι καὶ τὸ εἶναι αἰεὶ. τὸτο δὲ ὅτι
 λυθέντας μένειν ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ τῇ
 This cannot be the *Second Death* because
 is so frequently described by a *ceasing*

a ceasing to be for ever, never by an
 nity of Punishment. Yet it must be
 rstood of the whole Man. Otherwise it
 d be no great Unhappiness to him, if
 ody perished alone, and his Soul (that
 of him alone which is capable of being
 y) had still continu'd, and to Eternity.
 this kind of Death, this Great Man
 es natural to our whole Kind, when
 ted of Supernaturals. He goes on to
 ame purpose : Ἐστὶ μὲν γὰρ, κατὰ φύσιν
 πᾶσι θνητὸς ἅτε δὴ ἐξ ἐκ ὄντων γερονώς.
 ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ὄντα ὁμοιότησα, ἣν ἐρύλαττε
 πρὸς αὐτὸν κατανόσεως, ἡμβλυνεν ἂν τὴν
 φύσιν φθορὰν, καὶ ἐμεινεν ἀρδαρίῳ κα-
 ῖν ἡ Σοφία φησὶν. πρὸς σοφὴν νόμων βεβαι-
 ἀρδαρείας. He adds his Authority for
 : why he believed this Accession of a Di-
 Nature would immortalize Mens Souls ;
 why he believed that without it they
 d be mortal. Ἀρδαρίῳ ὅτι ἂν, ἔζη λοι-
 πὸς θεός, ὡς πᾶς καὶ ἡ θεία γραφή τῆτο ση-
 λέγουσα· ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοὶ ἐσε, καὶ υἱοὶ ἐψί-
 ῶντες· ὑμεῖς ὅτι ὡς ἄνθρωποι ἀποθνήσκετε,
 εἰς τὴν αἰὶν ἄρχόντων πίπτετε. Men there-
 who are no more than what that
 entitles them to, must naturally die.
 they only live, who have what
 er calls the Divine Nature ; they πρὸς
 ὁ λόγος τῆς θεᾶς ἐγένετο. So our Saviour
 it expounds this very passage of Psal.
 6. in Joh. x. 35. as the Spirit in us

is the εἰκὼν εἰκόνῳ, the Image of him
is the Image of his Father, the Invisible
the Image of the second Adam, the
from Heaven, proceeding on the My
way of Reasoning from the Old Testam
used in the New. Let any Author of
late Systems shew us as good Authority
his late Notions, if he can. But St.

nafius goes on ; Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Θεὸς ἐ μόνον
ὄντων ἡμᾶς πεποιήκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ καλὸν
ζῶν ἡμῶν ἐχαρίσατο τῇ τῷ Λόγῳ χάριτι
not this the Gift of God, Eternal Life ?

vi. 23. The blessed Father adds ;
ἄνθρωποι ἀπογραφέντες τὰ αἰώνια, καὶ
λίαν τῷ διαβόλῳ εἰς τὰ τὸ φθορᾶς ἔπιτρα
ἐαυτοῖς αἰτίαι τὸ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ φθορᾶς γε
ὄντες μὲν κατὰ φύσιν, ὡς περιέειπον, καὶ
χάριτι ὅτι τῷ Λόγῳ μετεσῆας τῷ κατὰ
ἐκρυβόντες, εἰ μεμενήκεισαν καλοί. Διὰ
συνάντηα τέτοις λόγον, καὶ ἡ κατὰ φύσιν
τέτων ἐκ ἡγίζε καθὼς καὶ ἡ σοφία
Θεὸς ἔκτισε τὸ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀρδαρασίαν
κόνα τὸ ἰδίας αἰδιότητι. φθόνῳ ὅτι
θανάτῳ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ κόσμον. [Sap.

24.] Τέτοις ὅτι γειομένους οἱ μὲν ἄνθρωποι
θνησκον, ἡ ὅτι φθορὰ λοιπὸν κατ' αὐ
μαζεν καὶ πλεον καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἰχθύες
ἔλα τῷ γένεσι, ὅσα καὶ τὸ ἀπειλὴν τῷ Θεῷ
παράδοσιν τὸ ἐντολῆς κατ' αὐτῇ περι
This Disadvantage, to our State of Man
that follow'd from our Violation of the
against the Forbidden Fruit, seems to

ne that is insisted on by the *Apostle*, Rom.
 both as by *curbing* our *Appetites*, the
 that curb'd them made them more
 ragious; and, as the *Divine Sentence* of
 th, threaten'd in that same *Law*, added
 our own *natural Constitution*, brought
 under a double necessity of *dying actually*,
 ch before was necessary only on one
 unt of our *Frail and mortal Nature*.
 e event therefore of this he makes *actual*
 b; Διὰ τὸ ταῦτα πλεῖον τῆς θανάτου
 τῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς φθορᾶς παρεμένεσσι κατὰ
 ἀνθρώπων, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀνθρώπων γένε-
 σις ἐκείνου· ὁ δὲ λογικὸς καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γενόμε-
 ὁ ἀνθρώπου ἡφανίζετο· καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς θε-
 μενον ἔργον παρὰ πᾶν ἄλλο, p. 58. The
 drawing of the *Divine Image*, the *Prin-*
 of *Immortality* is call'd ἀφανισμός, in
 sition to the ἀσάφεια, the *obscuring* of
 which is supposed to be the effect of
 y sin. The *Epithets* belong to it as
 call'd a *Light*, as entitling us to the
 itance of the *Saints in Light*. As there-
 the ἀσάφεια is its *shining darkly*, so as
 to be easily *discerned*; so its ἀφανισμός,
 s to imply its utter *disappearing*,
 ch must suppose, if not its *extinction*,
 its *withdrawing* from us, so as to leave
 the *consequences* of our own *mortal Na-*
 This he afterwards calls πάλιν εἰς τὸ μὴ
 ἀτὶ τῆς φθορᾶς ὑπερβῆναι, p. 59. He af-
 ards makes this ἀφανισμός the same

with ἀφάρσεις. So he says of *Mankind* general, that they were hereby τὴν τῆς καὶ εὐδοκίαν χάριν ἀφαιρεθέντες, p. 60. This he calls παρηφανίζετο, also in the same page. So ἀφανίζω θανάτον, p. 61, 62. And elsewhere frequently. What can this mean less than a *ceasing to be*, when the only Title to *actual Immortality* is either *withdrawn*, or *extinguished*? This therefore makes the *difficulty* in the *new design* of God in *restoring* Mankind to the *Immortality* originally *designed* for them. Repentance alone, he tells us, would not have been sufficient for it. Why so? Because the utmost that could do, would have been only sufficient to re-instate Mankind in their former *natural Condition*, when Innocent. At least, it could not *exalt* him above *Nature*; ἔτε ἡ μετάνοια διὰ τοῦτο κατὰ φύσιν ἀνακαλεῖται, ἀλλὰ μόνον παύει τὴν ἀμαρτημάτων, p. 59. So that being left to *Nature*, which was *Mortal*, he must have *continued Mortal still*, notwithstanding *Repentance*. Besides, the *Divine Veracity* obliged him to be *true* to his former *promised Threats*, of suffering *Nature* to take its course, and not to interpose in an *extraordinary* way for *preventing* it, when there was no *ingredient* in Man which could *any* claim to *Immortality*. So this Holy Person expresses himself: ἔτε τὸ εὐλογεῖν τὸ θεὸν ἐρύλασεν· ἐμὲν γὰρ πάντες ἀλλοτρίως

οὐκ, μὴ κεχατεμένων ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τῷ
 ὡπών, p. 59. Both these *Reasonings* sup-
 pose *actual Mortality* to have been the state
 which Mankind was reduced by the *Fall*,
 that *Repentance alone* would not suffice
 re-instating Mankind in the designed Im-
 mortality, without restoring him to the *Spi-*
 rit the *Divine Principle*, which was pre-
 natural, and had been *lost* by the *Fall*.
 Upon he grounds the necessity why the
 was to concern himself in recovering
 from this fallen state, the εἰκὼν *lost*
 at first derived from him, and there-
 fore could not be recovered unless he was
 enabled to restore it. Τὴν αὖτε χρῆμα πρὸς
 ποιοῦντι χάριν ἢ ἀνάκλησιν; ἢ τῆς καλῆς
 ἀρχῆς ἢ ἐκ τῆς μὴ ἐν αὐτῇ πεποιηκότος τὰ
 τῆς θεῆς λόγος; Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὡς πάλιν ἢ τὸ
 εὐχόμενον εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνεκεν, ἢ τὸ ὑπὲρ
 αὐτῶν εὐλογον διπλοῦσαι πρὸς τὸ πατέρα.
 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὡς τῆς πατρὸς ἢ ὑπὲρ πάντας ὡς
 ἀέδως ἢ ἀνακτῆσαι τὰ ὅλως Μόνῳ ὡς
 λόγος, p. 60. Whosoever therefore had
 the Spirit restored to him by the λόγος,
 by this Reasoning, be confirmed in
 natural Mortality by the threatening
 death upon the Fall, that God might ap-
 pear himself Veracious. That he would
 immortalize the Refusers of the Gospel to Pu-
 nishment, could not be known till the λόγος
 declared his Pleasure concerning it,
 and had it in his own power alone to give

Life to whom, or as far, as he pleased; to leave them to their *natural Mortality*. This he afterwards refers *Ebr. ii. 10.* in p. Accordingly he makes it the Office of Λόγῳ, who was *himself* the εἰκὼν of Father, to restore the τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνθρώπου. The words he uses for this purpose are ἀνανεῶσαι, ἀνακαμνίσαι, ἀνακτίσαι, p. Because this *Man* κατ' εἰκόνα is the νῦν καμνὴ κτίσις, which he makes the same with the ἀναγεννωμένη ἢ ἀνακτιζομένη ψυχὴ, p. He therefore makes it proper to the Λόγῳ ἀνθρώπου ψυχῷ ἢ ἀνθρώπων νῦν μεταπέσει p. 67. and ψυχῷ ἢ νῦν ὄραν, *ib.* Where we may understand that the *Minds* as well as the *Souls* of *Men* needed this *Immortality* which none but the Λόγῳ could confer, which alone could secure them from *returning* to their *natural Mortality*. So he again tells us: Οὐκ ἄλλα ἢ τὸ φθαρτὸν εἰς ἀφθαρτὸν μεταβαλεῖν, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸ Σωτὴρ ὢν, τὸ ἢ τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐξ ἐκ ἑνῶν πεποιημένον τὰ ἑλὰ ἢ ἄλλα ἢν τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα πάλιν ἀνακτίσαι ἀνθρώποις, εἰ μὴ τὸ εἰκόν ὢν τὸ παλιν εἶναι ἄλλα ἢν τὸ θνητὸν ἀθάνατον ἀναστήσαι, εἰ μὴ τὸ Αὐτοζωῆς ἔσσης τὸ κυρίως ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ p. 72.

22.

The same
St. Atha-
nasiaus, and the Catholick Church with him, prove the necessity of the Saviour's assuming even the Supreme part of our Human Soul against the Apollinarists, that even that might be rescued from Mortality.

The Controversie with Apollinaris, who made the Λόγῳ to perform the same Office

Christ, as our *rational Soul* to us, gave an occasion to be *particular* in asserting the *Mortality* of our *Souls*, since the *Fall* of *Man* has reduced us to our *natural Condition*. This Topick he thought necessary to insist on, that he might prove the *necessity* of *Christ's* assuming a *Human Soul* as well as a *Human Body*, in order to the *redeeming* both from the *Mortality* whereto they were both sentenced. He therefore asserts the *Souls* to be ἐν δεσμοῖς, which *Bonds* he calls the δεσμοὶ θανάτου. He tells us that *Christ* held the *Souls* of *Men* in *Captivity*: καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ αἰχμῇ τοῦ θανάτου ἡμεῖς ὡς ἐν δεσμοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ. He gives distinct Account how the *Soul* comes to be concerned in the Sentence of *Death* as well as the *Body*: That as the *Body* is concerned in that part of it, γῆ ἐστὶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ, the *Soul* is concerned in the other, θάνατος ἀποθανῆναι. *de Incarn. Christ.* p. 626. Here appears the *necessity* why *Christ* should assume a *Human Soul*, that ὅτι καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν θανάτῳ, ἐκείνῳ ὅτι ἀνθρώπου ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴν ἴδιαν ἔλαβεν, ἵνα καὶ παρὴν ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, καὶ λύσῃ καὶ κατακρίσῃ τὸ θάνατον. *de Incarn. Christ.* p. 629, 630. Accordingly he makes *Christ* Lord, in his *last* paid for us, to σώματα ὡς σώματα, καὶ ψυχὰν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς καὶ τελείαν ὑπαρξιν ὡς ὅλον ἄνθρωπον. He makes it no compleat Victory over-

Death, if the Soul, which sinned κατὰ γνώσιν, knowingly and designedly (which the Body could not do) should not suffer it: Πῶς ἡ κρᾶτησις τῆς θανάτου τελείαν ἐλάβει τὴν λύσιν, εἰ τὸ κατὰ γνώσιν αἴματι τῆσαν, τὴν ψυχὴν Χειρὸς ἀναμαρτητοῦ ἐκείνου σώματος αὐτοῦ. Τὶ ἐν καθ' ὑμᾶς, βασιλεὺς θάνατος τῶν ἐσθλῶν ἀνθρώπων; Τίνος γὰρ αἴματι, ἢ ἐβασίλευσέ ποτε; ἐκ ψυχῆς τῆς ἐν φρονήσει ἀμαρτητάτης; καθὼς ἐρηται, ψυχὴ ἡ ἀμαρτωσα αὕτη ἢ ἀποδανείσται, ὥστε ἡ ψυχὴν τίθειεν ὁ Χειρὸς λύτρεν ἀντίδοτον. p. 631. He takes occasion also, from the same Hereticks, to give his Opinion of Ψυχὴ and Πνεῦμα, the very same which thought so Unscriptural and Uncatholic. The νεφὰ ἀνθρώπου φύσις is, with him, the same with ψυχὴ. This some had called σαρκικὴν. Against whom he reasons thus. Πόθεν μαθόντες ἐ συνεπίσταμαι. Οὔτε γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ γεγράνεν ὅτι εὗρεν τῆτο, ὅτι ἐκοινῶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ λογισμῶ, τῆ Κυρίου γονίῳ, Μὴ φοβηθῆτε διὰ τὸ ἀποκτείναν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἢ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένην ἀποκτείναν. Καὶ πῶς, εἰ σαρκικὴ ἡ ψυχὴ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ἐ συνήσκει τῷ σώματι ἢ συμπεριφέρει. Πῶς ἢ ἡ ὁ Πέτρος τὰς ἐν αἵματι κατεκομίσθαι ψυχὰς πνεύματα ἰνομάσας ἔλεγεν, ἐπαρτοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ κατακειλεῖσθαι πνεύματα εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν, p. 639, 640. The σαρκικὴ ψυχὴ is here plainly opposed to the πνευματικὴ, and for that Reason supposed

posed as capable of being killed by Men, the Body it self, when that Soul is supposed destitute of the Spirit, which can secure it from the actual Mortality, which is also supposed to be natural to it. On the other side, the Souls in Prison, mention'd by St. Peter, are therefore observed to be call'd Spirits, as being otherwise incapable of subsisting in *Adms*, the Prison of separated Souls, as necessarily returning to their natural Mortality if they have nothing Spiritual in them; which is not alone from which they derive all the actual Immortality they can pretend to. Here therefore we have this glorious Champion of the Catholick Church, and the Church of our Age, fully of our mind, in opposition to the Heresie of Apollinaris. I might pursue further, through the other Writers against that same Heresie, and to lower Authorities of later Ages; but I think what I have said sufficient, as being really the best Authority, and what ought to be the Standard of future Ages.

In truth, these Notions of *ψυχή* and *πνεύμα*, in the Sense now explained, seem to have been as notorious in the Ecclesiastical Disputes of these Ages, as any other technical Terms derived from the Scriptures. The Gnostical Enthusiasts of all Hereticks from the days of the Apostles themselves.

23.
This Distinction between the Soul and Spirit supposed in the Disputes with the

sorts insisted on them, and indeed ground all their Pretensions to their *Gnosis* their *Appropriations* of the *Spirit* to their own Parties. Indeed, they meant, by the *Gnosis*, that *Knowledge* of *Divine Mysteries* which none could lay claim to, but *spiritual Men*, by the *Reasonings* of *St. Paul* himself, as well as of the *Mystical Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* of those Ages. On this they grounded their Claim to the *Pleroma*, the Place appropriated to the *Divine Spirit*, which was no other than the *Spirit*. The *Pleroma* was indeed the same with *Heaven*, the Place of *Immortal Beings*, their *Abode* the same with the *Platonick Idea*, as *Tertullian* observes. In Opposition to *Emptiness*, and *Appearance*, and *Falseness* of *Sublunary Beings*. And they thought it the Office of *Horus* to keep out all *Physical Men* from thence, as not being *ἐκ τῆς αἰσθητικῆς ἀφύσεως*. To such, if they have themselves well, they allowed a Place of Reward in the *Status Medietatis*, between the *Pleroma*, and the Place of *Punishment* of the *Devils*, that is, between *Heaven* and *Tartarus*. The *third sort* of *Men*, the *Choical*, of the *χρῆσται*, the *Dust* of the *Earth*, in the *Greek Interpreters*, they thought extinguished with their *Bodies*, therefore had no Concern to provide a future State for them. So *Tertullian*, in his Pretence of defending the *Spirit* of *Mor-*

and his *Prophetesses*, calls the *Catho-*
Psychicos, as *destitute* of the *Spirit*,
 cause they did not allow of his *Paraclete*.
 and this seems to have been the Plea of
Enthusiastick Hereticks, from the days
 the *Apostles* themselves. St. Jude seems
 only to allude to them, v. 19. Οὗτοι
 οἱ ἀποδοξίζοντες ἑαυτὰς, ψυχικοί, πνεῦ-
 μὴ ἔχοντες. He intimates the *Horus*,
 which they thought their Station in
Pleroma distinguished and separated
 the *Status Medietatis*, the Station by
 assigned to the *Catholicks*, as being
Psychici, and *destitute* of the *Spirit*,
 which themselves boasted. On the con-
 trary, St. Jude implies the ἀποδοξισμός, to
 only in their own Fancies, and *denies*
 Claim to the *Spirit*, turning the
 charge of being *Psychical* on themselves,
 which they had fixed on the *truly Catholick*
Church. He grants therefore the ἀποδο-
 ξισμός, to the *truly Spiritual*, and that the
Psychical have no *Right* to it. Only he
 makes the *appropriating* Application of
 the great *Rights* to them. He asserts, as
 very reasonably might, the *truly Apo-*
stolical Spirit to the genuine *Sons* and *Suc-*
cessors of the *Apostles*; which did, in *Con-*
sequence, overthrow their Pretensions to
Spirit, who opposed and undermined
 the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles*, and left them
 the State of being only *Psychical*. And
 pursuant

The Distinction between

pursuant to this Claim of the *Spirit* to
Catholick Apostolick Church, in Opposi-
 to these *false Brethren*, the *true Church*
 challenged also *true Gnosis*, as the excel-
 Dr. *Hammond* has observed in many pla-
 but especially in that famous Passage
St. Paul, where he styles the contrary
 of the Adversaries *Ψευδώνομον γνώσιν*.
 the *Gnosticks* themselves understood
 designed against their own Cause; as
 they therefore *denied* the Authority of
Epistle, as we are assured by *Clemens Alex-
 andrinus*, Strom. ii. p. 165. This I
 for a certain Conviction of their Mistake
 who will allow nothing in that *Key* for
 derstanding the Writings of the *New Testa-
 ment*, so much insisted on by that
pious, as well as *learned*, Doctor, whose
 Memory ought always to be had in
 honour in our Church, to which he was
 great an Ornament. And according
Clemens Alexandrinus himself challenged
 the Title of the *ἀληθὴς γνώσις*, to the
Catholick Church. So far the truly Or-
odox Christians, ev'n of those Ages, were
 from disapproving this Language, and their
 Opinions, ev'n of the Innovators them-
 selves. In that indeed they did differ
 from them, that they did not make
 Divine Ingredient connatural to the Son
 its first Constitution; and that the Or-
odox condemned the *Hereticks* for believ-

unnatural, and look'd on *this Belief* of
as the *Characteristick* of their He-
And the *Consequence* hereof would
be, that the *Catholicks* must believe
Soul mortal in its own *Nature*, when
did not believe this only *Principle* of
mortality connatural to it. And withal,
the *Doctrine* which made the *Principle*
immortality connatural to the Soul in its
Essential Constitution, and thereby
the Soul *naturally Immortal*, was then
for *Heretical* in those *first Heresies*,
which first made a discession from the
Catholic Communion, immediately after the
Passage of the Apostles. And here is also
Authority, far beyond that of *Cartes*,
in saying something *distinct* from *Spirit*,
and Motion. These Holy Fathers
loved the Soul it self to be so. And the
ancient Peripateticks had the same Opinion
Material Forms. Nor has that Phi-
losopher demonstrated the contrary, that
it cannot be an *active substantial Prin-*
distinct from *Matter*, yet depending
Matter in esse, in fieri, in operari, and
which must accordingly be dissolved on
the *dissolution* of that *Matter* on which it
subsists. If *Distinction of Conceptions* would
prove that would as well prove the *sepa-*
Subsistence of the *Divine Attributes*
which do as little include each other in
mutual Conceptions, as the *Conception* of
a mate-

a *material Form* can be pretended to in the Conception of *Matter*.

24.

The Doctrine of the natural Mortality of the Soul thus explained, can have no ill influence on our present Practice.

It is withal a farther Consideration removing *Prejudices* against this Doctrine that it leaves all *Obligations*, relating to *Practice*, as firm as it finds them. *Criminals* can derive no Confidence for *perseverance* in their ill Courses from the *natural Mortality* of their own Souls whilst they are withal assured that they shall be *actually mortal*. No more than they can procure their *Bodies* any ease in their *Eternal Punishments* after the Day of Judgment; because their *Bodies* are, without question, *Mortal naturally*, if God had been pleased to leave them to their own *Nature*. His *actually immortalizing* their *Bodies* to *Punishment* makes their Case as formidable in that regard, as if they had been *Immortal* of their own *Nature*. The Case is the same in their *Souls*. Their *actual Immortality* is sufficient for *eternizing* their *Pain*. Their *actually Subsisting* after the *Death* of their *Bodies*, exposes them to the same *sufferings*, ev'n in the *interval* between *Death* and *Resurrection*, as their *natural mortality* would. So that their *Sufferings* will be as long on *these*, as on the *more received*, Principles. Thus none who are concerned in these *Punishments* can get any *security* to themselves from this Doctrine of the *Souls natural Mortality*.

tain'd. All that can be pretended, is, that fewer will be concerned in them than commonly conceived to be. And that, I think, should rather be taken for an Advantage than an Inconvenience, if none thereby tempted to believe themselves secure, when really they are not so. And that there is no danger. They who are secure, by these Principles, are they who never heard, nor could hear, of the Gospel: All they, in general, who lived before the new Revelation mention'd by St. Paul, being all Men, from that time forward, whatsoever Place or Nation, to receive the Gospel as soon as it should be sufficiently divulged and proposed to them. But this is the concern of the Age we live in. Nor is it possible that any one now can hear of the Doctrine I am speaking of, without hearing of the Gospel too, because it is as the Doctrine of the Gospel. This being so, there will follow this, I think, an unavoidable Dilemma: They who never heard of this Doctrine, cannot possibly be guilty of any ill use of it; and they who do hear of it, must also hear of the Gospel, and therefore cannot promise themselves Security, if they still continue refractory, at any very Reason, because they must be supposed to have heard of the Gospel. They who therefore can promise themselves, by these Principles, no Security at all. How then can

can they be flattered into a *false security*. Their only *true Security* is, to be warned of their *Danger* before it be irremediable; and that will best appear by letting them see how far *their Case* is from the Case of those who can expect any *relief* from this *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of our *man Souls*. Where then is the *danger* where is the *abuse*, that can be made of this *Doctrine*, by them that *hear* it and *intentionally consider* it? I can foresee none that can be, by any *rational Consequence*. No *rational* Person will make any *resolution* for *Consequences* that *himself* believes to be *irrational*.

25.
The Im-
mortal-
izing Prin-
ciple was
generally
believed
no ingre-
dient in the
Nature of
the Human
Soul, a-
mong the
Heathens
themselves.

The great *difficulty* of this *Question* is in this, whether the *immortalizing Principle* was originally *designed* by *God* for an *Ingredient* of *Human Nature* in general? whether it was *intended* by *God himself* as a *separable Favour* for *some Men*, which he reserved in his own arbitrary *Pleasure*, whether he would confer it on *others*? If it had been an *essential Ingredient* in *Human Souls*, they must *all* of them indeed be *necessarily Immortal*. And the *Consequence* would be, That, if their *separate State* was a state of *Rewards* or *Punishments*, the *Rewards* and *Punishments* must likewise be *Eternal*. But there were but *few* of this *opinion*. The *popular Heathens* believed their *first Ancestors* to have been

next to have been *Heroes* or *Demi-*
 and the *later* Generations to have
pure Men. Unless the *supreme Being*
 pleased (ev'n in the *degenerous* Ages)
 confer the *nobler* Principle on some
Favourites, as *Princes*, or other re-
 able *Benefactors* of *Mankind*. Thence
 the *divine Honours* to *Founders* of
 ies, to remarkable *Princes*, to the *Ro-*
Emperors in course, to *Philosophers*,
 ally those that were *Theurgical*, and
 urites of *Princes*, as *Caligula's Sisters*,
Hadrian's Antinous. The *Pythagoreans*
 seemed of the same Opinion, if we may
 of their Sentiments by the *Golden*
 They there own their *Immortal*
 their *Heroes*, and their *Earthly Dæ-*
 of which their *Immortal Gods* alone
 supposed to have the *Immortalizing Di-*
Principle, which entitled them to
 in, the place of the *Immortal Gods*. The
 sure, were confined to the *Air*, and the
 rs? *Dæmons* to the *Earth*. But these
 in *H*ces seem only imputable to the *diffe-*
 indee of their *Free-wills* in keeping the
 Conseq *Divine Principle* more or less pure.
 e Stat qualified them for a *higher* or a *lower*
 ents, as giving them more or less of the
 likewise which enabled them to mount *higher*
 of this r. So we must understand them
 believed ncile them with the *Platonists*, who
 been ed the *Pythagoreans* in their *Theology*.
 For

For *Plato's Timæus*, is only the Doctrine
Timæus Locrus the *Pythagorean*, as appears
 by comparing both their Books still extant.
 And indeed, both of these suppose *Human*
Souls to be of a *Cœlestial Original*, and
 have a tendency thither again. Which may
 be on account of this *Superiour Divine Principle*
 which themselves own for the *Wing* that can mount them thither. Hence
 their Discourses concerning the descent of
 their Souls by some *Signs* of the *Zodiac*,
 and their return by other *Signs*. *Plato*
 implying, that the *Exile* of Souls was
 the *Sun*, as the *ἡγετὴς* of *Νῆς* or *Λόγος*,
 upper and *Diviner* part of the *Soul*, whose
 proper Course was in the *Zodiack*, which
 in *Heaven*, properly so call'd, in a constant
 distinction to those Regions which we
 reckon'd as *ὑπεράνωτοι*, or *Subcœlestial*.
Macrobius in his excellent *Commentary* on
Tully's Somnium Scipionis. And *Porphyrus*
 makes this Opinion as old as *Homer* him-
 self, one of the *eldest* Fountains of *Greek*
Traditions. For so he expounds the *Præ-*
ment de antro Nympharum of that *Præ-*
Poets. And indeed very ingeniously, he
 to make it probable that *Homer* himself
 might mean so. And indeed *Hesiodus*,
Cotemporary of *Homer*, reckons the
 degrees of the degeneracy of Souls from
 first Original. So that, by this Account
 Souls were supposed to have this *Divine*
 Principle

principle connatural to them. And these
 degrees of their *separate* state would only
 answer the πλεεσφύνησις, the *flagging* of this
vine Wing, occasioned by the *Corporeal*
inculencies, contracted by them in their
 preceding *Lives*. Nor did these *general*
counts hinder, but that *particular Persons*,
 in the *later* more degenerate *Ages*,
 might raise themselves above the ordinary
 of their *Coævals*, by a better Use of
 their own *Free-will*, and by *Purgations* of
 the *worldly Pollutions*. The *Mysteries* were
 thought one Expedient for clearing Souls
 of the βόελοπ, as *Plato* calls it, of *Matter*,
 which clogged the *Wings*, and added to the
 that was to be raised by them. *Philo-*
ny was thought another, for subduing the
 passions, those ἑλαι, the *Nails* of the *Soul*
Matter, as the same *Plato* calls them,
 by spiritualizing their Souls by an ἐπι-
 πορφή, that is their word, to *Divine* and
Material Objects, the *Heavenly Beings*;
Mathematicks, to which they also af-
 fixed much for facilitating their *return*,
 since they also were *separate* from *Mat-*
ter. Besides the two great *changes* of the
cosmos Magnus, of the *Platonick* revolution,
 which was to *restore* all things to the *same*
 wherein they were at *first* (that was
 ἀποκατάστασις) restored in course, two
External Purgations. As the *common*
 has a *Winter* wherein the *moist* *Prin-*
H
ciple

ciple prevails, and a *Summer* wherein *hot* is predominant ; so every *Platonic Year* was thought to bring with it a *Revolution* of *Inundations* and *Conflagrations* both of them of a *Purgative* Nature. In deed, all their ordinary *Lustrations* were those Elements of *Water* and *Fire*. Where there are the *intermediate* Purgations of *fiery Rivers* mention'd by *Plato* in his *Timæus*. For these also he thought *Purgative*, in a *greater* or *lesser* time, according to *degrees* and *aggravations* of the contrary *Pollutions*. But those could be only for a *Time* that the *Souls* so *purged* were supposed *not* to be in other *Bodies*. Thus there were provided *Purgatives* that might, in course, fit *Souls* for the *beginning* of a new *Revolution*. They who were *willing* to purify themselves, might, by the good *Use* of their own *Free-will*, gain *Heaven* sooner, and enjoy it *longer*, at least, to the *end* of the *great Year* wherein they were born : but they who were *not* willing to purify themselves, if they were to be purged by the now-mention'd external *involuntary* *Pollutions*, they could have no hopes of *Heaven* *immediately* after their *Death*, till they had undergone the *Purgations* to which they were *condemned* by the *Governors* of the *Universe* if their *Crimes* were of that nature as to be indeed capable of a *Purgation*. In which indeed that could *not* be expected, unless the *Crimes*

of all the *Transmigrations* they were to undergo through the whole *Platonick Year* proved expiable. But *Plato* owned that some Crimes were *ἀνίκατα*. If this were simply true, such Souls could never expect *Restitution*, but must be lost for ever, as *Winn* that *Divine Celestial Life* for which they were at first designed. So the *Revolutions* could not restore things to the same state wherein they were before. And there must new Souls sent down in their stead in the next Revolution. And this variety must, by an infinite number of *Revolutions*, make a great change in the *Uniformity* by which they conceived each Revolution should be transacted. For avoiding this, they thought own a greater Purgative Virtue in the *Revolutional Conflagration*, than in the ordinary Fires of *Adms*. This Expedient might all to act their Parts again in the new one, when the *Wicked* as well as the *Good* were thus at last to receive their *Expiation*. So it must be, if *Saturn* was again to reign in the *Golden Age*, and the *Titans* and the *Giants* were to act the Parts they had done formerly. They must all in course be dismissed from their *Chains* and *Confinement* to *Tartarus*. This is the *Consequence* of the *Immortality* of *Human Souls* as this *Hypothesis*, that no part of the *Divine Seed* might perish finally, if all *Human* Souls were thus far, at least, believed to be

of a *Divine Extraction*, not as the *Notion* of *Divine* might entitle them to *imperfect Perfection*, but as it might, at least, entitle them to *Immortality* and *Heaven*, *ἀνὲν ἐόντες* and *Ὀλύμπια δόματ' ἔχοντες*; both of them *Epithets* of *Gods*, in *lower* *Notion*, in the most ancient *Philosophers* seem to have influenc'd *Origen* in deriving our *Human Souls* into *Earthly Bodies* from a state of *Præexistence*: in *Heaven*; and in allowing a *Purgation* of *damned Spirits*, and the *Devils* themselves, in *Fire* of the *Conflagration*; and in making all purely *Human Souls* equal in this *Claim* to *Immortality*. He might possibly have learned them from those *Heathen Authors* whom *Porphyrus* pretends to have been *Guides* in his *Mystical Interpretation* of *Scriptures*. See *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi. 19.*

26. However, among the *Christians*, this *Doctrine* of *Origen* was taken for very singular. Nor did the great Authority of the *Fathers* recommend it to many among them. They generally condemn'd it in *Plato* himself. They generally took it for a *Maxim* in *Logic*, That whatever had a *Beginning*, could not be necessarily or naturally *Immortal*. On this Principle, they owned none *Immortal* but *God* Himself: No, not the *Angels*. So far they were from admitting the *Cartesian Principle*, That every *substantial* *Principle*

The Primitive Christians disliked the Doctrine of the natural Immortality of the Soul, in Origen and others; and reasoned on Principles inconsistent with the belief of it.

Motion, distinct from *Matter*, must thus be a *Spirit*, and *Immortal* in its own *Nature*. So far, even from the Doctrine of the modern *Schoolmen*, from the *Arabian Peripatetic Philosophy*. In truth, the *Heathens* themselves were not so Unanimous in it. *Plato* himself gives the *Mortality* even of *Demons* themselves, for a Cause of the *Oracles* of some *Oracles*. And *Aristotle* makes the *immortal Soul* *ὑπάρχον*, from within, as not ingredient in the constitution of *Man* in general, very agreeably to our *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, now described. I do not mention those *Heathens* who were not favourable to *Religion*. The *Apostle* himself speaks agreeably to this Reasoning: *οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀθανάσιον*, 1 Tim. vi. 16. as being the *αὐτοῦ ἀθανάσιον* from whom all, that pretend to *Immortality*, must derive it, from their own *Nature*. It is another Principle with them, That nothing that is *Corporeal* can be *Immortal*. And they charge the *Platonists* with being inconsistent with themselves, when they make *Human Souls* *Immortal* in their own *Nature*, and yet make them imprisoned in *Bodies*, and subject to all the other *Infelicities* that follow thereon. They accordingly prove from *Scripture*, that the *Soul* of the rich Man in the *Angels*, must have been *Corruptible* and *Mortal*, because he suffered the Torments mentioned. At least, that it could

not be *Immortal* in its own *Nature*. Thence *disprove* the *Immortality* of the *Heavenly* then *Gods* themselves, because of their *sufferings*, owned and commemorated by their own *Worshippers*. How then could they consequently own the *natural Immortality* of *damned Souls*, when yet themselves believed them liable to such exquisite *Torments*, even from *corporeal Fire*? And this as well in a *separate* state, as when they were *again* to be reunited to their *Bodies*. These the *Christians* took for *self-evident* Principles that could *not* be *denied* the whatever their later *Successors* think of the same Principles. Accordingly they condemn these *same* Doctrines in the *Gnosticks* those *earliest* of *Hereticks*, that they made their own *Souls naturally Pneumatical*, and consequently *Immortal* of their own *Nature*. And yet owned themselves liable to such *sufferings* as required such difficult *Concessions*, as themselves pretended for their own *restoration*. So they upbraid them with the *sufferings* of the *Sophia*, the *Heavenly Aeon* in the *Pleroma*, as utterly inconsistent with that *Divinity* of *Nature* which they ascribed to her. Yet those very *sufferings*, by their *Principles*, gave occasion for all that *Pneumatical Seed* which they thought propagated in this *lower World* for whose *reduction* to the *Pleroma* the whole *Hypothesis* was fitted. Nor could they

They also be of an *immortal Nature*, if *such* be an Argument to the contrary. And for this same reason, the *Catholick Church* of that Age could not believe the *separate Souls Immortal* in their own *Nature*, because they believed *ill Souls* under such *torments*, and that from a *corporeal Agent*, *Fire of Hell*. I know very well, that they are believed *now*: both that our *separated Souls* are *immortal* in their own *Nature*; that they are, notwithstanding that *liable* of those same *Punishments* from that *Fire*. And I have mention'd the *confessions*, of that *Nature*, among the *Heathens*, that *might*, and probably *did*, *persuade* them afterwards to believe these two *positions* reconcileable, who had a reverence for the *Authority* of the *Heathen Philosophers*, as the *Gnosticks* even then had. I only say, That this *Reasoning* could not have been admitted by the *Catholick Church*, if it differed from the *Doctrine* of those *Philosophers* in this very particular; and that they *confuted* them in things of the greatest importance, relating to their *Popular Gods*, and this *Principle*, That whatever was *possible*, *should not*, for that *Reason*, be *Immortal* in its *Nature*; because *Passion* naturally *tends* to dissolution. This *Principle* they took to be *self-evident*, as that they made it a *Criterion* for *Gods* and *Æons*. And they rested on it as a *Characteristick* in opposition

is *Immortal*, at least in *Fact*. This
 and $\phi\omega\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota$ in the *Gospel*, and that by
 8. Plainly alluding to the *Inheritance*
corruptible, that fadeth not away, of the
things in light. And this *Immortality* being
 the *Spirit* (as I have already shewn)
 which is the *Spirit of Christ*, and which is
 accordingly given in our *Saviour's Baptism*
 the only *ordinary Means* appointed by our
 our *Himself* for our *receiving* it at first;
 we can doubt but that our *Right* to an
eternal Happiness in Heaven must com-
 e from the time of our *Baptism*? That
 Believers are apply'd by the name of $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ as used
 in *Baptism*, not only by the *earliest Fa-*
thers but by this our *Apostle* himself in his
 Address to the *Ebrews*. But our state be-
 fore *Baptism* is represented as a state of
 true *Darkness* in opposition to the *Baptismal* $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$,
Darkness in opposition to the *Spirit* as it is
 $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma$, and particularly of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\upsilon\omicron\iota\alpha$ in op-
 position to the $\gamma\upsilon\omega\iota\varsigma$ the *knowledge of My-*
stical, or *Divine Secrets*, which was taken
 the *Gift of the Spirit*, and therefore ap-
 pointed to the *Spiritual Man*, 1 Cor. ii. 15.
 These are the *deep things of God*, ver. 10. *the*
things which are of God, ver. 11. *the things which are*
given to us of God, ver. 12. *the mind of*
the Father and of Christ, ver. 16. which the
Natural Man receives not, ver. 14. but the
Spirit of God, any more than any one can
 know the things of a *Man*, save the *Spirit*
 of

of a *Man* which in him, ver. 11. because they are *spiritually* discerned, ver. 14. The *mortality* therefore of the *Soul*, at least in *Heaven*, is here plainly supposed not to be known without *Divine Revelation*. What could not be admitted as true, if there were *Reasons* that could prove it *actually* true, it could be proved by *Reasons* drawn from the Nature of the *Soul*, as known to us in this *Life*, antecedently to *Divine Revelation*. Those *Reasons* would make it known to all who never had heard of *Revelation*, if such *Reasons* were so *evident* as our *Adversaries* pretend. But, proceeding on the *Principle* already insisted on, it is indeed a *Subject* of *Divine Revelation*, and could not have been otherwise known with that *certainty* which might support the *Practice* which *Revelation* expects in consequence of it. *Nature* is not sufficient to make the *Soul* immortal without the *Spirit*, which *God* was at liberty to give or refuse till he was pleased to promise it. And this *Promise* is the *Word* of *God*, and can no more be known without the *Revelation* of the *Spirit*, than the *Will* of a *Man* can be discovered by any other *Man*, without the intervention of the *Spirit* of the *Man*, whose *Mind* it is. The *Spirit* therefore is the *χάρις δωδεκά* foretold throughout the whole *New Testament* as well as in this place. And it is called a *Gift* for that very reason, that we may receive it

by understand that it is not *due* to our
in Nature. And *χαρις*, because it is
 ed for *Favourites* of God, not for such
 n lay no other *claim* to Divine *Favour*,
 s that *general* one, of their being crea-
 God. This being admitted to *peculiar*
 is, in the *Ebrev* Idiom, expressed
 ing *favour in the sight of God*, which
 same with *εὐρεῖν χάριν* in the Greek.
 hey who do so, are the fairest *Candi-*
 for such *Gifts*, as are taken for the
 y Indications of any Princes *Favour*.
 seems to be the *meaning* of the *Apostles*,
 the *Apostolical Writers*, when they
 and congratulate the *Encrease* of this
 to the *Churches* and *Persons* to whom
 write. They mean the *Gifts* and
 of this *Heavenly Spirit*, which from
χαρις are call'd *χαρίσματα*. So the
Virgin is said to be *κεχαριτωμένη*
 she was *overshadowed* by the *Spirit*.
χαρις and *Ἀλήθεια* are said to be *given*
ist, in opposition to the *Law* given
ses. Because the *Apostle* tells us ex-
 that the *Spirit* was not given by the
 of the *Law*, but by the *Obedience* of
 It is there call'd *Ἀλήθεια*, not in
 distinction to *Ψεῦδος*, (as when it
 osed to *opposite Christian Communion*)
 the *Σκιά*, the *visible Symbol* of the
nah, which represented the *Spirit* in
 gal *Consecrations* of the *Tabernacle*
 and

and the Temple. As the *Sun* in the Firmament is call'd the *true Sun*, in opposition to a *belius* in the Clouds, or in a *River*. And the name of *χάρις* is given it to shew, that none of the *external ritual Works* of the Law did deserve it, so neither did they confer it. So that God was still at perfect liberty whether he would confer it on the *Legally righteous*, notwithstanding the *Obligations* that had been pleased to lay upon himself by the *Legal Covenant*. So far it is from being imposed due to the rest of *Mankind*, who pretend no *Covenant* with God at all, even that of the *Law*. This therefore is the *Principle of Immortality*, but not *due* to *Mankind* in general; it must follow, that the *Souls of Mankind* (which cannot be immortalized but by this *Spirit*) cannot be mortal in their own *Nature*, by this Reasoning from *Scripture* and *Catholick Tradition*. It follows also, that even this *actual Immortality* could not be *actually known*, till God was pleased, by the *Revelations* of the Gospel to discover his *actual* design of giving *Immortalizing Spirit*.

28.

Even the
Jews of the
Apostles
Age (tho'
many of
them be-

lieved the Immortality of Human Souls, yet) knew of no Divine Revelation that might assure them of it.

Divine Revelation of the Old Testament.
 last, if it had been so in the Opinion of
 Jewish Sanhedrin. What the Doctrine
 that Sect was, St. Luke assures us, That
 denied the very being of either Angel
 or Spirit, Act. xxiii. 6. And what is the mean-
 ing of Spirit here, as it is joined with An-
 gels, is manifest from what has been already
 said. It is that *Immortalizing Spirit*
 which makes us *ἰσχυρούς*, that is, *Immortal*,
 and entitled to *Heaven*, as well as the An-
 gels. That same Spirit indeed, by which
 Angels themselves are entitled to *Immor-*
tal and their *οὐρανίου* in *Heaven*, as be-
 lieved themselves *πνεύματα ποιηρίας*, or *deities*,
 by their participation of that Spirit.
 which Christ himself is said to be the
 Head of *Angels*, and *Principalities* and
 Powers, as he is said to be the *Head of Men*,
 inhabited by that same Spirit, which
 was the Spirit of Christ, and Christ in
 the hope of *Glory*, that is, of that *Glory*
 which is *Eternal* in the *Heavens*. This
 obliged them to deny the actual Im-
 mortalizing of either Angels or Human Souls,
 if they denied them both that Spirit
 which could alone immortalize them. Yet
 they had their share in the Sanhedrin, and
 were qualified for the *High-Priesthood* it self.
 if they were from the least note of *Infamy*,
 or count of their holding this Opinion.
 could not have been, if the Jewish
 Church

Church had believed, even the *actual* mortality of *Human Souls*, to have been clear a *Revelation* of the *Old Testament*, believe it to be of the *New*. They were therefore who lived *nearest* to the *time* of *Texts*, which are *now* commonly produced for proving the *Immortality* of the *Soul*, did not so understand them as we do, at least they were not so *assured* as we are, that the *Ghost* did so *intend* them. How could it have been, if those *Texts* had been as clear in the *Cafe*, as we are sure those are in the *New Testament*? And how could they have been clear, if they, for whose *Capacities* the *Old Testament* was fitted, did not so understand them, nor found any received *Tradition* from their *Ancestors*, even *then*, which might oblige them to *believe* the *Doxology* *True*; if *not* as the sense of those *Texts* was as a *Tradition* received originally from their *Ancestors*? But really the *Opinions* then received among the *Jews*, are a sufficient conviction that they *knew* of no *divine Revelation* concerning the *future* of the *Soul*. Even the most *Spiritual* of all, that of the *Essenes*, contented themselves with the *popular* *Opinions* received among the *Heathens*, concerning the *Fields* in the *Fortunate-Islands* in the *World*, if we may believe *Josephus*. What may we expect from the *other* *Parties*? Their *Genius* was more gross and sensual?

Bel. Jud.
II. cap. 12.
Græc. Ed.
Coln. 1691.
p. 788.

souls, the ἀνεστῶτες αἰψοίς, as to the
 animals of the Ceremonial Law, owned
 their Rewards of the Good, but a Transmi-
 sion into good Bodies, nor any other
 punishments of the Wicked than those of
 fiery Rivers. Here was nothing, in
 any of these Hypotheses, but what they
 might have learned from the Pagans with-
 out any Divine Revelation; nothing that
 could be learned from any Divine Tradi-
 tion, or any probable Interpretation of the
 Scriptures; nothing that argues any Life,
 of the Soul it self, in Heaven; nothing
 supposes it to survive the World, or to
 have the same to the Resurrection; no-
 thing that shews why it might not then
 be reproduced as well as the Body; no-
 thing that all that would prove it Immortal,
 in their Opinion, though it might
 be the dissolution of our gross organical
 bodies. Nor are their received Notions,
 of the Gospel, any better. The
 Kingdom of Heaven expected by them, was
 a future Kingdom wherein they were to eat and
 drink; wherein they were to lie in Abra-
 ham's Bosom, alluding plainly to the accu-
 sations received of Favourites in the bosoms of their
 Masters, then received in their Festival
 entertainments; a marrying and being given
 in Marriage, as in the Story of the Wo-
 men married to the seven Brethren: a re-
 ceiving the Kingdom to Israel, and a sitting
 at

at the *right-hand* and the *left-hand* of the *Messias*, and their *ruling* of each other, as even the *Apostles* themselves expected, till they were *better* informed by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. Nothing of all this was supposed a state in *Heaven*, properly called, or a state *Immortal*; but rather the *beginning* after a *Platonical* Revolution. No one therefore supposed a *Spirit* given to *them*, that might either *raise* them from *Earth* to *Heaven*, or continue them to a *perpetual* duration. They could not have been *irresolute*, and so different among *themselves*, and so exactly agreeable to the *Opinion* of those who did *not* so much as pretend to a *Divine Revelation*, if themselves could have perceived a *Divine Testimony*. The *Christians* were *not* thus uncertain, and divided, when the *Matter* was cleared by a *Revelation*, which was *acknowledged* by them all. What was the reason of this *difference*, but that the *Revelation* of the *Gospel* was indeed the *Divine Revelation* that settled it? It perfectly agrees with what I observed formerly, concerning the *warning* given to the *Heathens* by *St. Paul*. God *warned* them, and *suffered* them to go on in their *own ways*, in their *omission* of what had *before* been their *Duty* to the *Supreme Being*, till he *acquainted* them that it was his *purpose* to *make* them *Immortal*, and to *reward* them accordingly, which was first

med by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*.
 in that time therefore he expected their
 reliance under those *Pains* to which their
 discovered *Immortality* made them ob-
 jectious.

The *Earliest Writers* suppose that God 29.
 at first design this *Immortality* for all The Title
to the Spi-
rit, on ac-
count of the
former
Peculium,
 m's *Posterity* (if he had not fall'n) by was per-
fectly ar-
bitrary.
 giving this *immortal Spirit* to them. But So they
who were
not Prose-
lyted into
that Pec-
ulium seem
to have
been so long
left to their
natural
Mortality.
 whether he continued that design of making
 an actually *Immortal* since, is not so cer-

The *Scripture* makes the choice of
Peculium perfectly arbitrary, which
 only supposes the *Favours* reserved for
 not due to the rest of *Mankind*, on ac-
 count of the essential *Ingredients* of their
 common *Humanity*. So it is described in
 choice of the *Israelitish Nation*, rather
 of any other *Nation*, to the *Privilege*
 the *Peculium*; that it was not for any
 advantages themselves could pretend to
 any other *Nation*; but because God
 pleased to signalize them with those
 distinguishing *Favours*, for his own sake,
 his great *Name* which was called upon
 by which he had appropriated them
 his own peculiar *Care*; and on account
 the *Promise* and *Covenant* he had been
 ed to enter into with their *Patriarchal*
 ancestors. Plainly supposing no such Ob-
 jection on account of their descent from
 the common *Original* of all other
 Nations.

Nations. The same *liberty* is again asserted God, in his Proceedings with the *Posterity* the *first appropriated Patriarch, Abraham* himself. Even *his* Posterity were not included in the *Peculium*, but only the Descendants of *Isaac*, not of *Ishmael*. even in the seed of *Isaac*, *Jacob* alone loved, and *Esau* hated, as being post-poned to his younger Brother, in this greater *National Favours*. For all these Passages are not to be understood of the *Persons* of these Patriarchs, but of the *Nations* which could pretend to them as their *Paternal Ancestors*. And I know not what can be clearer to this purpose, than the opposition insisted on by *St. Paul*, between the *first and second Adam*, between *Adam* our *first* genitor and our *Blessed Saviour*: That *all Adam* die, and that it must be from *the Saviour* the *second Adam* that all must derive their title to the *Life*, that is opposed to the *Death* derived from the *first earthly Adam*. We are said to be *in Adam* whilst we have nothing but what we derive from *him*, as *essential* to our *Condition*. And what that is, the same *Ap. Paul* shews, when he calls it the *ψυχὴ ζωοποιεῖ* in opposition to the *πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖν*. The *latter* he makes only derivable from *God* as being the same with the *Image* of the *second Man*, the *Lord from Heaven*, as the *ψυχὴ* is the *Image* of that *Earthly Man*.

from whom we receive all our pro-
Human Nature. This πνεῦμα is that
 which he acknowledges as a *Prin-*
of Immortality; that *Immortality*, at
 which can *Immortalize* our Happiness.
 so far also of *Immortal Punishment*, as
 are *actually Immortalized* by God to
ishment, beyond the *Principles* of their
Human Nature, but they who had it in their
 er to have been *Pneumatical*, if them-
 s had *pleased*. This *Spirit* is the *Spi-*
of Christ, and is *given* by him *alone* in
Baptism, according to the *Reasonings* of
New Testament. This *Baptism* admits
 to *one Body* with *Him*, which *Body* is
Church. The same *Baptism* is the *Laver*
Regeneration, and the *renewal* of the
Ghost. This therefore *alone* entitles us
in Christ. So *St. Paul*, no doubt, un-
 stood it, when he speaks of those who
 been *in Christ* before himself. His
 thing was, That they had prevented
 in their *initiation* into the *Church* by
ism. Such are *in him*, as *Members* of
Mystical Body are said to be *in the Body*
 which they are *incorporated*, as the
ches are said to be *in him* as the *Mystical*
 But principally as being *one Spirit*
 him; and, as on *that* account, the *Scri-*
 owns that form of *speaking*, that *Per-*
 so *spiritually united* to him, are said to
 the *Spirit*, and to be *in the Αγία* as

well as the *Λόγος* in them. But the *Logos* derived from *Adam*, as his *εἰκὼν*, includes also the *πνεῦν ζῶν*, the *flatus* in *Tertullian* which is given to all Nations, according to the fore-mentioned passage of *Isaiah*, and the *Mystical Interpretation* of it received by the *Christians* from the *Jews*, which does not of itself make us *Immortal* according to the sense of the first *Christians* but only qualifies us for *Immortality* by *Union* with the *Spirit*, which alone entitles us to *actual Immortality*. Though we have both, without the *Spirit*, we are in the first *Adam*, and bear his *Image* in whom we all die. Plainly therefore, this *Scripture Hypothesis*, none can lay claim to *Immortality*, but on account of the *Divine Spirit* actually received; or of the *Divine arbitrary Pleasure* actually immortalizing them for *Punishment* who might have had the *Spirit*, if they would have complied with the *Terms* on which they were to have received him. But the utmost extent of the *Mystical Body of Christ* (as described in the *New Testament*) extends farther than the *Patriarchs* and *Prophecy* of the *Old Testament*. Those *Patriarchs* especially, with whom *God* was pleased to make the *Patriarchal Covenant* for themselves and their *Patriarchal Seed*. Such were *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and some before them in an ascending Line.

those Patriarchal Covenants which entitled
 their Posterity to the *indefinite* Favours of the
Abrahamic, were certainly *limited* to the De-
 scendants of those Patriarchs, in *opposition*
 to all other coeval Patriarchal Heads of
 other Nations. So God himself explains his
 design, when he tells us that he had
 dealt so with any other Nation. And the
 notion of their being a *chosen* Nation, and
 a *peculiar* People, implies the same. Those
 Nations therefore could lay no claim to the
 mystical Body of Christ, till they were ad-
 mitted into it by the terms of the new Pe-
 cuniary, and the new Revelations of the Gospel,
 which could not be till the partition-wall
 was broken down by the Cross of Christ, and
 therefore could concern none that lived be-
 fore the Incarnation. From the Time there-
 fore of the first choice of even the old Pe-
 cuniary, to the breaking down of the partition-
 wall, the partition must have continued,
 which made all Nations, besides the Jews,
 a *separate* Body from that which our Blessed
 Lord was pleased to take for his own *Mysti-*
 cal Body. So long therefore they could not
 be Members of his Body, nor consequently
 could they be *in him*, whilst they were *not*
 of his Church, in the largest Interpretation
 of it. And not being *in him*, they could
 not be made *alive*. Not being *in him*, they
 could still remain in the old Adam, in whom
 they were all to die. Not being *in him*,

they could have no pretensions to the *Spirit*, which the *Apostle* admits for the *Principle of Immortality*. They were *grafted* in the *old Olive*, which was *wild* by *Nature*. Nor could they *partake* of the *sap* and *fruitfulness* of the *good Olive*, *πίζαν* and *πρόν* Rom. xi. 17. before their *ἐκτέλεισμός*, the *Inoculation* into it. Nor could they do so before their *Incorporation* into the *Mystical Body of Christ* by *Baptism* in their own *names*, who could lay *no* claim to be *admitted* into it, on account of any *Covenant* made with their *Fore-fathers*. Nor are they *admitted* into the *Church* with any *Encouragement* of being *accepted*, till *Act. xiii.* long therefore, by the *Doctrine*, even the great *Apostle of the Gentiles*, the *Gentiles* are reckoned as in the *old* and *former Adam*, as *bearing his Image*, and as liable to that *actual Mortality*, which he perpetually *owns* as the *necessary consequence* of *being so*. Nor had they hitherto any *reasoning* of their being *preternaturally immortalized to Punishment*, mentioned by *St. Paul* *Act. xvii.* which might put them in *danger* of being concern'd in the *great day of Judgment*, on account of *God's* having *renewed* the *permission* formerly indulged to them of *walking in their own ways*. These things seem so *certain*, by the *Reasonings* of the *New Testament*, and the generally-received *sentiments* of the *Apostolical Age*; that I

no reason to doubt but that the *rest* of *ankind* (who could plead no Title to the *or New Peculium*, nor were ever qualified for being *received* into *either*, by *Con-* *stances of Divine Providence*, not for *want* *any Diligence* of their own) were still left the *consequence* of that *Mortality* which *is natural* to them.

Yet, as I know how much the *contrary* 30.

Opinion has prevailed, so I am *are* what *Proofs of Scripture* *have been pleaded* in favour of *at Opinion*. The *Texts* that *our our Blessed Saviour's De-* *of Universal Redemption*, *have been thought*, thus far at *st*, conclusive, as to prove all *uman Souls* secure from *actual*

The Universality of those, who are mentioned as concerned in the Revelations of the Gospel, does not necessarily include any more of the Gentiles, than those who liv'd after the Preaching of the Gospel, and who had heard it preached to them.

mortality, not only *genera singularum*, but *gulas generum*. But I know not how *en themselves* can *own* this to be the *se of those places*, consistently with their *in Principles*. What is here supposed to *derived from Christ*, is *opposed* to what is *ived from Adam*, and the *living Soul* is *re instanced* as the *particular* derived *of Him*. Yet even this *Particular* can- *be supposed* derived from *Adam*, accor- *g to the present Opinion* received from *Augustine*, which makes it immediately *ated by God*. That therefore this *Soul* *reckoned* as derived from *Adam*, can be

The Distinction between

understood no otherwise than as the Soul is an Ingredient in the *Humane Nature* as derived from *Him*, by *all* which we are said to bear his Image, as having all the same natural Ingredients in us as were in *Him* on account of the *Human Nature* which is common to us both, on account of an universal Generation. If therefore *all* that we have common with *Adam* (no not even the noblest Ingredient of all) cannot hinder from dying as we are in *Him*; it will follow that even actual Immortality cannot be derived from any thing that is essential to our common Nature. Plainly therefore that Image of God, that *Man* from Heaven which St. Paul ascribes to our Blessed Lord, is preternatural and supernatural, and not necessarily agreeing to *all* that agree in the same Human Nature. But the true design of such Passages, is, to disown such a Confinement under the *New Peculium*, as has been formerly under the *Old*, to one certain Nation. And, on the contrary, to declare all Nations qualified for being received into the new Peculium, without any obligation to quit their received National Characteristics, or to incorporate themselves into any one particular Nation, as they were obliged to do before. Withal, this Universality extended to all particular Persons who came any way to the Knowledge of the Gospel after it was promulged: that God did as for

ly design, and desire, the rewarding of
 every individual Person, who qualified him-
 self for the favour, by receiving it, and by
 joining himself in the Communion and Society
 of the Authoriz'd Preachers and Promulgers
 of it, as he veraciously intended the Punish-
 ment of them who were wanting to them-
 selves in not receiving it, when sufficiently
 exposed to them, and who could not be pre-
 vented on to qualify themselves for Eter-
 nal Rewards, by threats of Eternal Punish-
 ments, in case they would not qualify them-
 selves for Eternal Rewards. These Notions
 of Universality are perfectly sufficient for
 the design of the first Propagators of the
 Gospel, to oblige all that heard them to
 comply with the Terms that were requisite to
 enable them to the Benefits of the Gospel.
 This design did not any way oblige them to
 change their Opinion of Predecessors out of
 the Old Peculium, and before the Terms of
 the New Peculium were settled and promul-
 gated, with whom the Preachers of that Age
 had not any the least concern. Nor were
 they concerned in any of the other Disputes
 which were started in that Age. I have, on
 the contrary, shewn from the Apostle's own
 words, That the Case of the Gentiles, then
 engaged, was judged different from the Case
 of their Ancestors, even as to that particular
 obligation, of their Obligation to enter into
 the true Peculium. How then can it be
 gather-

gathered, that the *Immortality*, which could only be expected from *Christ*, was *not intended* for them who had never heard of *Christ*, nor of any *Obligation* incumbent on them to *believe* on *Him*, nor any *hope* being *accepted* by *Him*?

31.

There is no necessity, that all who died in Adam should be immortalized by Christ.

The words indeed of the *Apostle* are express: That *as in Adam all die, so in Christ all shall be made alive*, 1 Cor. xv. 22. *Not* is the word used in *both* parts of the sentence. But it may be easily referred to *Adam*, and to *Christ*; and, being so referred, that will not prove the *Event*, but only the *Condition* of *Men*, so long only as they are *in Adam*, and as they are *in Christ*. So the obvious meaning would be: That, as all who are *in Adam* die, so all who are *in Christ* shall be made *alive*. This may be very true, and is so by the Principles now mentioned. But it does not therefore in any way imply, that *all* who were in *Adam* shall ever be in *Christ*, or shall therefore receive from *Christ* the Privilege of *Immortality*; which *none* can have, who does not receive it from *Him*. And, in truth, the concern of the Dispute was not, whether *Men* simply, but whether they who were *in Christ*, should *rise*? This appears from the *Objection* of the *Hereticks*, who raised the Dispute, as we have it represented by the *Apostle* himself. Their Pretence was, That *the Resurrection was past already*, 2 Tim. ii.

doubt, on account of the *Baptismal* symbol of rising out of the *Water*, by which rising with *Christ* is both signified and fulfilled. This *Resurrection* they understood of dying to *Sin*, and rising to *Righteousness*, as the *Apostle himself* does also elsewhere understand it, yet not so as to exclude the *Resurrection* of the *Body* also. But *Hereticks* seem to have taken this advantage from that *Concession*: That, because that *Mystical Resurrection*, from *Sin*, was effected in the *Soul*; there was therefore need of extending the *Promise* signified that *Symbol*, on *God's* part, further, of another, and a distinct, *Resurrection* of the *Body* also. This stating of the *Question* the *Apostle* also supposes in his *Reasonings* against these *Hereticks*. He also *Reasons* from *Baptism*, 1 Cor. xv. 29. Observing that the principal design of *Baptism* was purposely to assure us of that Article, of the *Resurrection* of the *Bodies*, which was then received with the greatest difficulty. That he reckons the denial of that as an annihilation of our whole *Baptism*, as that which would make the profession of Faith required from *Catechumens*, as a qualification for their *Baptism*, useless; and the remission of *Sins*, which a *valid Baptism* was designed to expiate, also null, if the *Body* is to receive no benefit from the *Baptism*. That is the importance of his words: *Your Faith*

Faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins, ver.
 This would, in the consequence, overthrow
 their own Notion of a *Resurrection* from S
 if their *Baptism* had been *unavailable*
 their *Expiation*. But the *Principle* on wh
 this *Reasoning* proceeds, is, That the gr
 design of *Baptism*, is to make us *one w*
Christ, as well *Bodily* as *Spiritually*. So
 is, that we are said to be *Baptized into*
Body, 1 Cor. xii. 13. That is, by the *Bap*
 of *Water*, as well as we are *Baptized*
one Spirit, by the *superiour* part of the *B*
rism of the *Spirit*. And indeed we
 qualified for our *Union* with *Christ* in
Spirit, by our being first made *one Body w*
Him. So that this *lower Baptism* is fun
 mental to the other. And our *Union* in *S*
vit must fail, if we be not first made
Body with our *Lord*; which will ruine
Union pretended by these *Hereticks*, in
 this *Bodily Union* should fail, which is
 fundamental to all this *Reasoning* of the *Apo*
 This therefore being supposed, that we
 made *one Mystical Body* with *Christ* in
Baptism: it will follow farther, that
Bodies are to be *invested* with all the
vilages of *his Body*. This must be un
 stood as *Covenanted* on *Christ's* part, wh
 we consider these *Baptismal Symbols*,
 only as *Signifying*, but as *Covenanting*, *Sy*
bols, for Performance on *Christ's* part
 what is *signified*, and therefore *covenanted*

part. But the *Resurrection* of our Lord
 should be no *Mystical Resurrection* from Sin,
 because *He knew no sin*. It could therefore
 only concern his *Body*; and his *Soul*, no
 otherwise than *consequently*, as it was con-
 cerned in the Events of his *Body*. How-
 ever, it was not even his *ψυχή*, but his
Σπῆμα, which is supposed, in this Reasoning
 of the *Apostle*, as the Principle of *Immortality*.
 For the *Resurrection* of our Saviour's
Body, that he lays down as a Founda-
 tion of his whole *Preaching*, and of his
 whole *Apostolical Office*, which was to be
 an *Authentic Witness* of the most memo-
 rable *Acts* of our Saviour, but particularly
 his *Resurrection*, as has already been ob-
 served by others. So he, *ver. 14, 15*. Hence
 therefore he gathers farther, That if *Christ's*
Body was raised, our *Bodies* must be
 raised also. Which Reasoning depends on
 the *Act* of *Christ* in *Baptism*, whereby
 he is pleased in that *Sacrament* to accept,
 and receive, our *vile Bodies* into a *Mystical*
Union with his *own Body*, so as to oblige
 himself to treat them as if they had been
 his *own Body*; and not to think any
 sort of *Privilege* to his *own Body* com-
 munion, unless it be communicated to all
 others also, whom he has been pleased to
 admit to this honour of being accounted as
 his *own Members*. So he Reasons elsewhere,
 concerning the *Members* of this same
Mysti-

Mystical Body. That the members should be the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it: or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it; 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26.

the Reasoning holds in relation to the Concern particular Members ought in Reason have for all the fellow-members of their common Body. Which must certainly proceed more strongly concerning the Head, whose Concern, for observing the exact Rule of Reason and the Publick Good, must infinitely exceed that of any purely Human Members. But there is another Topick of Reasoning allowed in this Body, whereby a Representation of any Member of it, as representing the whole, is judged in Law sufficient to convey a Legal Right to all the other Members of the same Body, as being indifferently judged a Legal Possession of all the other Members by such their Proxy, though they do not as yet enjoy the fruits of such a Legal Title. The same way as the Earnest Penny in possession, conveys a Legal Title to all the remainder of the agreed Price. As we are said to be already set down in Heavenly places, Eph. ii. 6. because our Brethren in the Church Triumphant are already in possession of Heaven it self. So the Apostle Reasoneth from our Saviour's Resurrection to ours. He is the first-fruits from the dead, ver. 16. As the Consecration of the first-fruits

ed, in Law, to extend to the whole Har-

And as he is the first-begotten from

dead. The Consecration of the First-born

secrated the whole Families. And the

secration of the Levites, in lieu of the

born, was a Consecration of the whole

elitish Body. Thus Baptism was *ἐν*

νεκρῶν, ver. 29. as it gave them a security

the Resurrection of their dead Carcasses.

They are elsewhere frequently, in this Di-

ce, call'd *νεκροί* simply without an Article.

Does the Article add any new Emphasis,

Some conceive; *ὁ νεκρός* does also sig-

a dead Carcase, though of a Woman, as

the Cases of Lucretia and Virginia. But

this Reasoning, grounded on our Bap-

, can only concern those who are ad-

ed to the Honour of Baptism. The Con-

ences are only true concerning such, That

Christ be risen, they must rise also; and

if they do not rise, neither can it be

that he is risen. For they only are his

members, and they only are the Harvest

which he is the First-fruits, nor are any

of the Family of which he is the

born. Nor is it pertinent to this pur-

to include any of the rest of Mankind,

ly on that general Account alone of

having born the *εἶμα* of the first Adam.

It is very pertinent to the same purpose

include the generality of those who are

Christ by Baptism, lest otherwise the

He-

Dionys.
Hal. Hist.
L. XI. l. 9.
p. 677.
Ed. Oxon.
& l. 13.
p. 684.
vid.

Hereticks might put it off as a singular Case, that the *Body of Christ* had been raised, if none besides were concerned in it. withal, that every *Individual Baptized*, *professed Christian*, might, from this general Inference, be assured of the *Resurrection of his own Body*. This therefore I take for the true sense of this place, which does in any way imply, that all, who ever were *Adam*, shall be *immortaliz'd by Christ*, without whom there can be no hopes of *Immortality*.

32.
The Apo-
stle inti-
mates,
that, in the
space be-
tween A-
dam and
Moses,
they, who
had not the
Spirit,
were left
to their
actual
Morta-
lity.

This sense also is confirmed by the Expressions in the parallel place of *Rom*. There the numbers concerned in the Death introduced by *Adam*, or the *Immortality* introduc'd by *Christ*, are said to be *two*; that is, of those who are concerned in the event of actual Death or actual Immortality. So, through the offence of one, many are to be dead; and the grace of God, and gift of Grace by one Man, *Jesus Christ*, to be abounded unto Many, ver. 15. And, As by one Man's Disobedience, Many were made sinners, so by the Obedience of one, shall Many be made Righteous, ver. 19. And that all men are included, appears from ver. 14. where βασιλεία of Death is confin'd to the space between *Adam* and *Moses*. As *Adam* the first by whose sin Death descended upon his Posterity, without any sin of their own, but as they sinned in him, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.

aplos, v. 12. They are said *not to have*
been after the similitude of Adam's trans-
gression. That is, not against a *Law* given
 them as the *Law* concerning the forbid-
 Fruit was given to *Adam*, to be obser-
 by *Adam*, not by his *Posterity*. The
 Law given the *Peculium* to be obser-
 by them in their *own* Persons, he rec-
 as to have been that of *Moses*, which
 refore he makes to have been the *first E-*
ve, from whence a breach of *Law*, which
 ight be judged *criminal* in them, was to
 dated. So he reasons: *Sin is not imputed*
where there is no Law, v. 13. That is, where
 Law, against which the *Sin* is commit-
 is not in the *power* of the *Sinner*, whe-
 he will keep or observe it. The *Rea-*
 ng is the same as before: *where no Law*
there is no transgression, Rom. iv. 15. And
 design seems to be, to make out this
 λεία of *Death*, mention'd on the same
 sion. It alludes, if I mistake not, to
 ἡ δὲ βασιλεία, *Wisd. i. 14.* another *Hel-*
 ical Author, about the same Age. Whe-
 the *Apostle* derived the *form* of *speaking*
 n that place I cannot say. However
 place alone is sufficient to shew that
 form of *Speech* was *familiar* among
 as the *Apostle* himself was, *before* his
 version. Now by βασιλεία here, that
 ful form of *Monarchy* cannot be under-
 d (which is opposed to *Tyranny*) as li-
 K mited

mitted by Considerations of *Equity* and *Conscience*; but rather that very *form* which is by those called *Tyranny*, in regard of its *Arbitrariness*, though not of its *Usurpation*. This βασιλεία therefore of *Death*, thus explain'd, implies such a *Power* of him who has the power of *Death*, Ebr. ii. 14. as is unavoidable by him who is *obnoxious* to the sentence of *Death*, by any means in the power of the Patient. That is the Case of those who suffer by a Law *violated* not by themselves, but by *another*, who has the power of concluding them so far, at least by his *own* Acts, as to *involve* them in the participation of the *Punishment*, however otherwise *innocent* in their *own* Persons. Such it was in the Case of *Achan's Children*, and the first *Child* of King *David* by *Bathsheba*, and the *Posterity* of *Saul*, who were *punished* by the command of *God* himself for the *sins* of their *Ancestors*, to which they could not possibly have been *accessary*, by any Contribution of their *own*. The Reason therefore of *their* sufferings, was entirely derived from their being contained in the *Ancestors*, by the most antient *Patriarchal Right*, received then as a *Jus Gentium*, by the *Civiliz'd Nations*. And probably without a *Divine Positive Constitution*, though too antient to be proved so, as being far *more* antient than the *Invention of Letters*, which were the only means

wh

which it was possible that the *History* of the
Legislation it self, could have been convey-
 ed to *Posterity*. However it is most certain
 that the thing it self was thought *just*, be-
 cause God himself required it, who deals
 with *Men* by the same Rules of *Equity* by
 which they regulate their dealings with
 each other, and therefore appeals even to
 themselves as *Judges* of the *Equity* of his
 own dealings with them. This therefore
 the great Apostle supposes to be the Case
 of the *Death* inflicted on *Adam's* *Posterity*,
 within the *space* now mentioned, before the
 promulgation of the *Mosaic Law*, for a *Trans-*
gression of a *Command* imposed on *Adam's*
Person, which was no otherwise imputable
 to them than as they were, by this Rule
 of the *Patriarchal Covenants*, included in him,
 and, on that account, chargeable with the
 guilt of the *Transgression* of a *Personal Com-*
mand: ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἠναπτόν. But the Case
 is otherwise afterwards, when that *Law*
 is given, which was intended to be ob-
 served by every *Individual Person* of the
Posterities concerned, as well as by their
Patriarchal Ancestors. Here it was in the
 power of every *Individual*, by the use of his
Free-will, to entitle himself, as well
 to the *Rewards* of the *Observation*, as to
 the *Punishments* of the *Violation*, of that
 the *Law*. This Case therefore was the
 same with that of *Adam* himself, wherein

the *Power of Death* was not so *Absolute* and *Regal*, when it was in the *Power* of each *Free will*, to exempt it self from the *Power* of the *captivating Tyrant*. Not so, when the *Fate* of the *whole Posterity* was to be determined by one *single Act* of the *Patriarchal Ancestor*, which, if it were an *evil* one, exposed them all to *Punishment*, whether they would, or no. Here therefore was no *avoiding* the *Punishment* so incurred. These therefore could have no *hopes* of *Immortality* by this *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, as being wholly *determined* by the *single Act* of *Adam*. This Case continued from *Adam* to *Moses* in the *Posterity* of *Cain* and *Ham*, notwithstanding the different Cases of *Seth* and some other particular *Patriarchs*. And the *Law* given by *Moses* was the *first Act* of *Divine Legislation*, as of a *Peculium*, after that given to *Adam*, as is mention'd in the *Scripture*, wherein *Life* as well as *Death* are proposed as *Obligations* to the *Duty* required by it, and which might therefore put them in *hopes* of *actual Immortality*, which exceeded the *power* of their *Nature*, as a *Reward* of their *Obedience*. Before, this very *Reasoning* of the *Apostle* seems to imply that the *greatest numbers* of those, who lived within *that Period*, were left to the *consequence* of their *natural Mortality*, in being abandoned to the *uncontroulable Power* of *Death*.

a King. This therefore is a clear connection that the *universal* Clause, used in the same Chapter, in the same Case, ought not so to be understood, as to contradict this plain *Doctrine* of the Apostle: nor indeed does it any way seem *inconsistent* if fairly understood. The words are these: *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the Righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life, v. 18.* It is almost certain, that all individual Men have the benefit of *actual* Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, in the same latitude of signification wherein the word is taken when they are said to be liable to the condemnatory sentence of *Death* for the Sin of Adam. It is therefore much more agreeable to the *Apostle's design*, to understand the *Universality* in the sense now explain'd, of those who accept of the Gospel upon their receiving it preached. So that the *Parity* respects rather to the Case, than to the equal *Universality*, of the *Persons* concerned in it. In which *Universal* Particles are to be limited according to the exigency of the *Subject* in the Scripture. So the Apostle concerning the day of Judgment, *Then shall every man give praise of God, 1 Cor. iv. 5.* His meaning is not, That every man shall have praise of God, who shall then appear before that most exact and impartial *Tribunal*; but,

That every *Man* shall have it, whose *Cause* shall then be *judged* to deserve it. And it is usual, - even in ordinary *Conversation* not to mention such *limitations* as every *Person* concern'd would have judged unnecessary to the *design* of the *Speaker*, that in such *Cases* wherein he had otherwise plainly signified his *Mind*, as that he could not mean his words in the *unlimited* sense if he would speak *consistently*.

33.
The Light
that en-
lightens
every Man
that com-
eth into
the World
is the $\Pi\nu\omicron\nu\eta$
not the
 $\Pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$.

There is another *Text*, which may be thought favourable to prove that the *Spirit* is given to every *particular* by *Christ* himself. Which, if this be the true meaning of it, will prove that all are *actually immortalized*, and must therefore be concerned in the *general Judgment*. It is this, *This was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*, *S. Joh. i. 9*. These words are spoken of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$, and therefore of our Blessed Saviour, as to his *Divine Person*, as he is that *second Adam*, and the *Lord from Heaven*. So it is, that he is concerned in this *additional* perfection of *Human Nature*. This *Light* is the same with the *Principle* of the *new Life*, which is that which is *naturally immortal*. So the *Evangelist's* former words imply: *In him was Life and the Life was the Light of men*, *v. 4*. therefore this *Light* was given to all men; the *mystical Life* must, at the same time (by this *Reasoning*) be supposed to have been

en given them also. What then can hin-
 der their being *actually Immortal*? Nothing
 could do it, if the *Gift* here spoken
 as derived from the *Λόγος* to *all men*,
 had been the same with that *Divine Spirit*,
 which the *Scripture Reasoning* supposes as
 the *Principle of Immortality*, as the *Qua-*
rs fanſie. But it is ſo certain, from the
 current of the *New Testament*, that *all*
men have *not* that *Spirit*; that this is alone
 ſufficient to aſſure us that ſuch a ſenſe as
 that is, *could not* have been intended by the
holy Ghost in this place. *Moses*, wiſhing
 that *God's People* were *all Prophets*, plainly
 ſuppoſes that *all God's People*, even of that
æculium, had not the *Spirit*. Accordingly
 it is ſuppoſed, as the *Privilege* of the *New*
æculium, that they ſhould be *all taught* of
 God, in regard of this *Unction* of the *Spirit*,
 which was to *teach them all things*, this *Wiſ-*
dom, which in *all Ages* entering into *holy Souls*,
 made them *friends of God and Prophets*, *Wiſd.*
ii. 27. So the *Evangelist* tells us, That the
Spirit was *not yet given* before our *Lord*
 was *glorified*. And the *Apoſtle*, that it was
 at his *Aſcenſion* that he *gave gifts unto men*,
 meaning theſe *gifts* of the *Spirit*: And that
 they had received it *not by the Law, but by*
the Obedience of Faith. So the *New Testa-*
ment takes it for a *Prerogative* of our *Savi-*
or's Baptiſm to give the *Spirit*. At leaſt
 to that general *Union* of our *Lord's*

Disciples in the *same Spirit*, so as that who ever had *not the Spirit of Christ*, should for that very reason, be concluded to be *none of his*. And the pretended Gnosticks are said to be *Psychical, not having the Spirit*. And all that were out of the *Orthodox Communion* are therefore, through S. John's first Epistle, supposed to be in *darkness*, and liable to all the dismal *Consequences* of being so. So far it is from being possible, by *Scripture Principles*, and his own *Doctrines* so clearly expressed elsewhere, that the same S. John could mean that every man, who comes into the *World*, should have this *Light* of the *immortalizing Spirit*. His meaning therefore cannot be of the $\omega\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, but the $\omega\nu\omicron\eta\zeta\omega\iota\varsigma$, which was *not* taken for a *Principle* of *actual Immortality*, but only as a *qualification* for it, which might put Man in that *middle station* of indifferency between *Mortality* and *Immortality*, to be determined by the *Event* of his own *Free-will*. This is common to every man that cometh into the world. And therefore this it is, which our Apostle makes in all men, enlightened by the visitation of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\&$, as an *external Principle*. Yet so as not to make any change in the *Nature*, in the Person so enlightened without *peculiar Divine Favour*, and dispositions in the *recipient*, for such a *Union* with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\&$, as may *qualifie* it for the *Divine Favour* of raising it above its own *Nature*.

Till then, they are *separable* again, and this
 eternal Visitation of the Λόγος leaves the
 Πνεῦμα as *Mortal* as it found it, where
 there is no particular *design* of God for im-
 mortalizing it to *Punishment*. So the Apostle
 himself explains his own meaning: *The*
light shineth in darkness, and the darkness
comprehended it not, v. 5. And so Tatian Orat. cor. 1.
 concerning this *Human Soul*: καὶ ἐαυτῷ Græc.
 πάλιν ἔστι καὶ ἐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωτεινόν, καὶ τὸ
 σκοτεινόν ἀεὶ τὸ εἰρημνύον. ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς ἐκα-
 ταμύβανει. The Soul still remains in *Dark-*
ness, as it was, where there is no κατέλαψις,
 which the Soul may lay hold on the Light,
 and unite it self with it, so as to receive
 the benefit of the *Illumination*, and to be
 continually illuminated by it. Till then, it can-
 not, by these *Principles*, have any Title to
 the regions of *Light* and *Immortality*. Tatian
 goes further for clearing the meaning of
 these *Principles* of the *Evangelist*. He de-
 termines this κατέλαψις which must cause the
 Soul to be in the power of the dark Soul,
 which makes it necessary that the πνεῦμα have
 the κατέλαψις of the Soul, in order to the actu-
 al *Immortalizing* it. So he goes on: ψυχὴ
 ἐκ αὐτῇ τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δὲ ὑπὸ
 τῆς καὶ τὸ φῶς τῷ σκότειν κατέλαβεν, ὁ λό-
 γος μὲν ἔστι τὸ τῆς θεῆς φῶς· σκότος δὲ ἡ ἀνε-
 μωρὸν ψυχή· Διὰ τὸ μὲν μὲν διαίτωμένη,
 οὐκ ἔστι τῷ ὕλιν νεύει καὶ τῷ συναποθνήσκουσα
 σαρκί· συζυγίαν δὲ κεκλήμενη τῷ τῆς θεῆς
 πνεύματι.

πνεύματι. ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀλοήθη. ἀνέρχεται ὁ πνεύματι.
 ὅπερ αὐτὸν ὁδηγεῖ χωρεῖα τὸ πνεύματι. No
 doubt he perfectly understood the impor-
 tance of these terms among the *Platonists*
 from whom the *Evangelist* borrowed them
 and therefore, in this matter, is a fair In-
 terpreter of what the *Holy Ghost* was pleased
 in using them, to confirm with his own *Di-*
vine Revelation. The rather, because the
Scripture it self agrees so exactly with him
 in the *Consequences* of what he delivers
 here. The *Scripture* also ascribes the ἐν
 ληψις to the Λόγῳ, not to the *Huma-*
Soul. That very word St. *Chrysostome* re-
 corders by ἡγεῖα ληψις, as being of the same sig-
 nification. The *Scripture* also owns the
 ζυγία, the *Spiritual Marriage*, between
Christ and the *Soul*, as *Tatian* does also be-
 tween the *Soul* and the *Spirit*. *Christ*
 the same way the *Head* of the *Man*, as the
Man is of the *Woman*. Here therefore is
Mystical Marriage, no *Arrha* of the *Spirit*
 which may entitle to the remainder at the
Resurrection. The *Ptolemaick Gnosticks* also
 in *Irenaus*, have the same Notions of the
Invisibilty of their *Spiritual Seed* from the
fallen Aeon to those of the *Psychical Nature*
 notwithstanding the glimpses external
 given them. Yet they did not think such
 glimpses so received, sufficient to improve
 those *Psychical Beings*, to any excellence
 exceeding their own *Nature*. This Reason
 then

Hebr. ii.
 16.

Therefore is very agreeable to the *Platonick* terms, understood as the *Platonists* themselves, whose terms they were, did usually understand them. And that the Language of *S. John* in this beginning of his *Gospel* is *Platonical*; *S. Augustine* owns, not only from his own observation, but from the acknowledgment of the *Platonists* themselves. *Cicero* also a professed *Platonist* owns it, whose words we have preserved by *Eusebius*. Which being granted, it must be also agreeable to the sense of the *Holy Ghost* himself, as he has been pleas'd to express his sense in these then known *technical* terms of the *Platonists*. This I have proved provedly in my *Prolegomena* to my honoured Tutor's Book *de Obstinatione*. Our modern *Enthusiasts* therefore are very much mistaken, when they hence prove all Men to have the *Spirit*, so as to be *actually* illuminated by him. No union of *Spirit* and *Soul* without a *κατάληψις*. No *κατάληψις* successful for *σωτηρία* from this *World*, but that whereby the *Spirit* lays hold on the *Soul*, which cannot be expected where the *dark* *Soul* has no *κατάληψις* of its own. The want of this, leaves such a *Soul* in its former *darkness* and *disability* to mount into the regions of *Light* and *Immortality*. This preventing *κατάληψις* of the *Spirit*, without which that of the *Soul* is insignificant, may probably be the preventing *Grace* of the *Spirit*,

rit, asserted by the *Catholick Church*, in opposition to the *Pelagians*. And the denying it arbitrarily was then more reconcilable with the *Divine Goodness*, when the want of it did not expose the *Soul*, to which it was denied, to *Eternal Torments*; while *God* was pleased not to oblige them to hold on this preventing *Illumination* under any penalty for neglecting it, but only by the prospect of promoting their own greater *Interest*.

34.
The dead
in Christ
who are to
rise first,
are not opposed to the
dead out
of Christ,
but to those
who continue not
in him till
their
death.

There are also other *Texts* which may be thought favourable to this general concern of all *Mankind* in the *Resurrection*. The *dead in Christ* are said to rise first, 1 *Thess.* 16. But that does not necessarily imply that they shall rise at all who never heard of *Christ*. The *dead in Christ*, are they who are actually received into *Christ's Mystical Body*; and not only so, but who have continued in the *Mystical Body* to their *Life end*, so as to die in it. For it is the *Resurrection to Happiness* that is here spoken of, not a *Resurrection simply*, as indifferent to *Happiness* or *Misery*. So it appears from that parallel Text; *Blessed are they who are in the Lord*, *Rev.* xiv. 13. The *dead in Christ* are the same with those who die in the *Lord*. And the *Resurrection* spoken of, is only such a one as makes the Persons concerned in it *Blessed*. So it appears also in another place, where mention is made

his first Resurrection: Blessed and holy is he
 that hath part in the first Resurrection: on
 which the second death shall have no power,
 Rev. xx. 6. And this is the Resurrection
 which is usually meant in the Sacred Wri-
 ters, when the word is mentioned simply.
 The Resurrection to Misery, is thought as
 little to deserve the name of a new Life, as
 a Resurrection. It is therefore called a
 second Death, when Life is restored for no
 other end but to qualify the Person for an
 eternal Punishment, for which his own Na-
 ture had not qualified him. This Text
 therefore gives no account of them who are
 concerned in the Resurrection to Punishment:
 those who had been formerly in Christ,
 though they did not die in him; and those
 who might have been in him, if themselves
 had pleased, though they never were in
 him actually. These are sufficient for the
 second Resurrection, though all out of the
 Resurrection Peculium, who had never heard of our
 blessed Saviour, should never be concerned
 in it at all.

But the same Apostle tells us, that, As 35.
 many as have sinned without Law, shall also
 die without Law: and as many as have sin-
 ned in the Law, shall be judged by the Law;
 Rom. ii. 12. Here some Advantage may cer-
 tainly be taken from the Variation of the
 Apostle to perish, rather than to be concerned in the Judgment rela-
 ting to the Breakers of the Law.

They who
 knew of
 no Divine
 Law by
 which they
 were to be
 judged, are
 supposed by

Phrase :

Phrase: that which is called *perishing* in the former part of the Verse, is opposed to being *judged* in the latter: And that the *perishing* here mentioned, may as well be understood of a *ceasing to be*, as of any *positive* Inflictions; and that it looks as if it were *designed* to intimate a *Diversity* in the two Cases, that the *Phrase* is so industriously altered. The Words may indeed bear that Design, yet there may be another Reason of the Change. *Judgment*, properly so called, seems to relate to a Tryal by a *Law*, and it was taken for one of the Privileges of the *Jews*, that God had given them a *fiery Law*, Deut. xxxiii. 2. where in the Heathens could not rival them. Yet even the *Sins* of the *Gentiles* must suppose a *Law* violated by them, as every Sin is ἀνομία, though that *Law* was not promulgated out of the midst of the *Fire*, like that of *Moses*. The same *Law* reached the *Gentiles* also so far, as the Parity of Reason reached the Case of the *Gentiles*. And the *Promulgation* was sufficient, where the *Equity* of the *Law* was acknowledged even by them. In this case, the Apostle's Reasoning holds, that *having not the Law* [that is, of the *Jews*] *they are a Law unto themselves*, v. 14. So that, in this Regard also, God's Punishment of the Heathens may also be called a *Judgment*. And that it was so intended, seems very probable from

om v. 5. where the Judgment of the Jews
 said to be *in the Day of Wrath, and Re-*
velation of the righteous Judgment of God, v. 5.
 that Day is the Day of Judgment, as ap-
 pears from v. 16. *in the Day when God shall*
judge the Secrets of Men by Jesus Christ, ac-
ording to my Gospel. These Words are se-
 parated from the Words objected only by a
 parenthesis, and are therefore committed
 immediately with the Case of the Jews.
 therefore the time when the Gentiles,
 who have sinned without the Law, shall pe-
 nish without the Law, be the same with that
 wherein the Jews are to be judged by the
 Law; both Procedures must be referred to
 the Day of the general Judgment. And,
 though the Word *perish* may bear that
 weaker Sense of only *ceasing to be*, yet it is
 so used, in the Scriptures, concerning
 them whom all must believe liable to the
 severest positive Inflictions. Judas himself
 called υἱὸς ἀπωλείας, S. Joh. xvii. 12. Yet of
 this Case our Saviour himself assures us,
 that it had been good for him if he had not
 been born, S. Matth. xxv. 24. S. Mar. xiv.
 which could not have been true, if his
 punishment had been no more than a dis-
 continuance of that being received at his
 birth. So concerning the Vengeance in-
 flicted on them who obey not the Gospel:
 they shall be punished with everlasting De-
 struction from the Presence of the Lord, and
 from

from the Glory of his Power, 2 Theff. i. ὁ λεθρον αἰώνιον is the Word. So concerning those who denied the Lord that bought them, ἐπαγόμτες ἑαυτοῖς ταναὴν ἀπώλειαν. 2 Pet. ii. 1. The Word therefore will indeed bear a larger Signification. Yet, *this* place, *Annihilation* may, perhaps, be more natural. So it will be best opposed to the case of being judged, as the Jews must be. And so it will best answer their State of being ἀνομῖ, without Law, as the same Apostle himself expresses it. Their being without Law to themselves, as owning the Reasonableness of the things impos'd as a Law by God on the Jews, but not on themselves would no farther oblige them to the Observation of them, than as their own Interest might prevail with them to observe them, as they would avoid the Punishments, and obtain the Rewards of Providence in this Life; and as they would avoid the ill Consequences of not observing them, and enjoy those Benefits which were naturally consequent to their Observation. But this would not make them liable to the Judgment, as it was to award Rewards and Punishments for the future. That any future Rewards or Punishments were to be was a new Revelation of the Gospel, particularly of the Gospel preach'd by Paul himself, v. 16. as I have now observed from Acts xvii. 31. But there

Uses of that Day: the former, not
 properly *Judicial*, but to give an account
 of the *Justice of Providence* in all its past
 dispensations, by bringing every secret
 to light. That Use of a general Ap-
 pearance, is intimated in the *Revelations*
 of the *Old Testament*, Eccl. xii. 14. For dis-
 covering the secret *Vertues* that had been
 rewarded in the *Prosperity of Sinners*, and
 unknown *Wickednesses* which had been
 punished by the perpetual *Infelicities* of bet-
 ter *deserving* Persons, and the many un-
 known ways of God for adjusting those seem-
 ing Incongruities to the Persons respective-
 ly concerned in them. This part of the
 procedure of that Day, required the pre-
 sence of all, as well as of the *Peculium*. Nor
 was there any Intimation, that even *Mortal*
 Souls might not survive the *Body*. The
 Vehicle, on which they depend, as it was
 more subtil than their grosser organized
 Bodies, so they were thought to continue
 after the *Dissolution* of their *Bodies*,
 to continue the Existence of the *Souls*
 depend on them. These *Vehicles* are
umbrae, the εἰδωλα τανόντων, owned ge-
 nerally by the Antients from a consentient
 Tradition of which no Original is known,
 and therefore very probably from those
 divine *Revelations*, which all Accounts of
 the earliest Nations believe familiar in the
 Ages of Mankind. No other Original

is so likely of such *Traditions* wherein *Nations* were agreed before that mutual *Commerce*, and the Art of *Letters* by which they might *communicate* their *Inventions* to each other. However there can be little doubt but that the *Primitive Christians* were agreed in it. They believed *separate Souls* to have *visible Bodies*, of the same *Shape* with those wherein themselves lived formerly. Yet they believed *those Bodies* also *Mortal*, as being capable of *sensible Pain* by the *Corporeal Fire* of *Hell*. *Passibility* was by them believed to be a *Tendency to Dissolution*, as I have already intimated. As therefore these *separate Souls* were capable of *sensible Pain* in the *Interval* between their *first Death* and *final Judgment*, so they might be dissolved by that more exquisite *Fire*, which was to prevail in the last *Conflagration*. At least so far as to deprive them of any *sensible Pain*, which they ascribed to a *separation* of their *Parts*. And without *Sense* we can hardly frame any *Idea* of a *Rational Soul*: None certainly that can be capable of *Punishment*. That therefore the *Souls of wicked Christians* shall be enabled to endure *Eternal Burnings* without *Dissolution*, by these Principles, to be ascribed to the same Almighty Power, by which the *Children* were preserved in the *Fiery Furnace*. Only what was then performed

Mercy, will here be ascribed to a Design of inflicting a more *exquisite Punishment*. Yet the *grossness* even of these *separate Vehicles* (we may call them so) was the Reason why even *Souls*, designed for *Happiness*, were thought *disabled* to ascend to *Heaven* the *Day of Judgment*; and in the mean time were thought to need the *Prayers* of their *living Brethren* on *Earth*, whilst they continued in those *separate Receptacles*, where *Evil Spirits* were permitted to have Access.

As therefore even these *actually-mortal* *Souls* were generally thought to *survive* the *grosser Bodies*, so there is Reason to believe that they may reach the general *Resurrection*. And indeed the *New Testament Revelations* seem generally to suppose that they shall indeed reach it. How else could the Men of *Nineveh*, or the Queen of *Sheba*, rise up in *Judgment* with the *Generation* which heard our Saviour's *Preaching*, and *condemned it*; if they were not, at least, to appear before that same Tribunal, in which the *Despisers* of our Saviour's *Teaching* were responsible? How could the Lord pronounce the *Cases* of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, mentioned in the *Old Testament*, and of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, as more *tolerable* in the *day of Judgment*, than those of *Jeruzalem* and *Bethsaida*, and *Capernaum*, where he *preach'd* and wrought his *Miracles*,

36.
Yet they might probably persevere in their Being till the day of the general Judgment. The Punishment of the Sodomites not in Hell. Fire.

cles, if those *Heathens* were not to appear at the *day of Judgment*? Nor is it easily intelligible, how the Case of those *Heathens* before the *Gospel* could be more tolerable the *day of Judgment*, than the Case of those who had the Honour to hear our Saviour's *Preaching*, and to see his *Miracles*, if, besides the Vengeance, for which they were so famed in the History and Prophecies of the *Old Testament*, they had an *Arrear* of Punishment to commence at the *day of Judgment*, that was to be *Eternal* and suitable to the monstrous *Nature* of *Crimes* for which they were to be inflicted. But the Case will be very easie, if their appearing at the *day of Judgment*, be with the Design of concerning them in the *Judgment* of the *Day*, but only in the *Retrospective* part of the *day*, for vindicating the *Divine Providence*, in Relation to what had been transacted by it formerly. In this Respect that most formidable Example of *Divine Vengeance* on the *Sodomites*, by *Fire* from *Heaven*, was not to be compared with the Punishment of the *meanest* Criminals under the *Evangelical Dispensation*, on account of this single Consideration alone, that the *Fire* of the *Sodomites* had an *end*, and proceeded no farther than that *General* Punishment, but the *Fire* prepared for *Evangelical* Criminals, is *Eternal*, and exercised on Subjects *extraordinarily* enabled to suffer it eternally.

I know the excellent Dr. *Hammond* receives the *Sodomites* themselves to be in *Hell*, and proves his Opinion from the words of *St. Jude*, v. 7. where he affirms them to suffer the *Vengeance of Eternal Fire*. As he gathers, because the Participle *ᾔονα*, is in the *Present Tense*, which that great Person understands so, as if the *Sodomites* were *then* in *Hell* when *St. Jude* wrote that Epistle, and as if *St. Jude* reasoned from that *Supposition*, that they were there. But had he reason'd so, he could not have reason'd from any *Authority* of the *Old Testament*. That had mentioned nothing concerning them, but what was *past*; no thing in relation to *them*, but that wherein *Sodom* and the *Cities about them*, as well as the *Inhabitants*, had *perished*; no *Hell* revealed *there*, wherein any but *Devils* were concerned; no *Revelation* then that *Men* should be concerned in *that Hell*, which was originally prepared *only* for the *Devil* and his *Angels*; nothing concerning the *Eternal Punishment* of them who were *there*; nothing particularly of the *Sodomites* being there, or *continuing* there the *Times* of the *Apostles*. How then could *St. Jude* gather any such Doctrine from the *Revelations* of the *Old Testament*? He reasons from it, as he does here, against them who were to be concluded by those *Authorities*? The *Stile* indeed of the

Old Testament Prophecies, is full of Allusion to the *Judgments* of the *last Day*, even when it foretels *Judgments* confessedly *Temporal*, and which were fulfilled long before the *Apostles Age*. The reviving of the *Bones* in *Ezekiel*, was performed in the *Return* of the *Jews* from their *Captivity*. The *Day of the Lord* in *Joel*, is by *S. Peter* interpreted of that very time when he *Preached*, though described with all the formidable *Circumstances* which cannot *literally* applied to any but the *last and general Judgment*. And it is plain, that the *Dramatical Hyperbolical Expressions* in the *Prophecies* of the *Old Testament*, were understood of any such *general Judgment* by the *Jews* of the *Apostles Age*. If they been so, there had been no need of a *new Revelation* to the *Apostles* for this *purpose*, for satisfying their *Contemporaries* of the *Truth* of it. *S. Jude* therefore must have argued from his *own Authority* and that of his *Fellow Apostles*, if this had been his *Meaning*. Why then did he add, *according to my Gospel*, as *St. Paul* in the same *Case*, *Rom. ii. 16.* when he insists on this *Revelation* of the *New Testament*, concerning the *Day of Judgment*. But to what *Purpose* had he done so against these *Despirers of Dominions*, and *Blasphemers of Dignities*; these *Separators* of themselves as more *excellent* than any of

en in being, not excepting the *Apostles*
 themselves? That is the Notion of ἀποδιο-
 τες εἰσὶν, v. 19. as the *Pharisees* did,
 who had that *Name* given to their Sect,
 because they were also of the same Humour.
 But there is no need, that I can see, why
 we should have Recourse to that more vio-
 lent Interpretation. The ἀδιόριστος πῖρ, is
 very naturally applicable by the *Reasonings*
 of that Age, to the Fire from Heaven, by
 which the *Cities* of Sodom and Gomorrah
 were burnt, according to the Sacred Histo-
 ry. So the Writers of the *New Testament*
 and the *Platonists* reckon all the *Invisible*
heavenly Archetypes, 2 Cor. iv. 18. the
 things which are not seen, are eternal. So
 the *Mansions* in Heaven are called Eter-
 nal Tabernacles, in Allusion to the σκηνὰν
 of the *Israelites*, in their Pilgrimage from
 Egypt to Canaan, St. Luke xvi. 9. So the
 Manna, the true Bread from Heaven, is that
 which gives Life to the World, S. John vi
 33. which was no otherwise true of the
 Manna in the Wilderness, than as its de-
 scending from Heaven, qualified it to be a
 type of the *Heavenly Manna*. Accordingly
 the Life given by that Manna to the *Israe-*
lites, who were fed by it, could be no o-
 ther but a *Heavenly Life* in Reversion, to
 such as were qualified for it, because that
 generation, who were Partakers of it, did
 notwithstanding generally perish in the

Wilderness. And therefore, on the same account, the *Fire of Sodom*, as descending from Heaven, might, by the same *Mystical Reasoning*, be stiled *Heavenly*, and therefore *Eternal*. Not only so: That same *Fire* might be a further *Type* of the *Fire of Hell*, in which all should be concerned who should be guilty of the *like* Impieties under the Dispensation of the *Gospel*. And that on that general Account, that *things*, which befel those who lived in the earlier Ages, befel them as *typical Examples* to those upon whom the *Ends of the World* were to come, 1 Cor. x. 11. And this I take to be the true Design of S. Jude: That the *Fire from Heaven*, by which the *Sodomites* were punished, was a *predictive Symbol* of the *like Fire* reserved for the *Gnostick Hereticks* he speaks of, as guilty of the *like Immoralities*, under the Dispensation of the *Gospel*. And so were many other like *Examples* of those *first Ages*, which were confessedly *Temporal*, for that is a general Rule in these *Reasonings*; that what was *Temporal* in the former *Legal Dispensation*, which was it self no more than *Temporal*, did signify and predict something answerable to it under the Dispensation of the *everlasting Gospel*; but differing from it in that Particular that the *thing signified* was, according to the *Nature of the Dispensation*, under which it was to take place, it self, *eternal*.

Also. So the *Fire* from *Heaven*, which destroyed the *Sodomites*, though it *self* was *extinguish'd* with its *Fuel*; yet signified a *Fire* that should *never* be *extinguish'd*, that could punish the *Rebels* against the *Eternal* Dispensation. And that extraordinary Con-
 vance of *God* in sending it from *Heaven*, when he could, if he had pleased, have made use of *Fires* occasioned by *Humane* Neglects for the same Purpose: That, I imply'd, in *this* way of Reasoning, that should have another *Fire* answering it, under the more noble Dispensation, that should be, like the Dispensation it self, *Eternal*; because a *Fire* from *Heaven* was to be so interpreted. This Analogy holds the more exactly, because the *Fire* of *Hell* it self, which the *new Revelation* shows as *Eternal*, is also described as being of the same *Cælestial* Original; not as breaking out from the *Centre* of the *Earth* it self, and its *subterraneous Volcanoes*, as Philosophers have fancied. So, *The Lord* Jesus shall be revealed from *Heaven*, with his *mighty Angels*, in *flaming Fire*, taking *Vengeance* on them that know not *God*, and that deny the *Gospel* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. Therefore *God* himself is often called a *consuming Fire*, Deut. 4. ix. 3. *Hebr.* xii. 29. in regard of *Schechinah*, which has the Nature of *Fire*, as well as of *Light*. So he is described:

A Fire shall devour before him, Ps. l. This is that which so affrighten'd the Jews in the Delivery of the *Law*, and which makes it so *impossible* to see his *Face* and *live*. And seems to be alluded to by the *Poets*, when *Semele* is said to have been burnt by *Jupiter*, appearing to her in his *native* *Glory*. Therefore his *Angels* the *Satellites* of his appearing *Presence*, are said also to be a *flaming Fire*, *Ebr. i. 7.* from *Ps. civ.* This *Fire* therefore of the *Magestical Presence*, is by all represented as *Eternal*; and as the *Original* of that which shall *destroy* the *World*, and *continue* the *Punishment* of those who are *adjudged* to it, to all *Eternity*. And because the *Fire* which destroyed *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, is said to have *come down from Heaven*, their *Punishment* might very well be ascribed to the *Eternal Fire*. Yet it does not follow that because the *Fire*, by which they were punished, was *Eternal*, therefore this *Punishment* must have been *Eternal* also. Rather on the contrary, the *Eternals* of the *Gospel* being generally typified by *Temporal Symbols*, it will be more agreeable, that the *Fire* of *Sodom*, as a *Type* of *Hell*, should have been *Temporal* also. And so that *Fire* was indeed *Temporal*, as to the *Execution* inflicted by it on those two wicked *Cities*, which seems indeed *only* alluded to by *S. Jude* in his *Epistle*.

That will indeed appear to be the most probable way of understanding him, if we compare him with the parallel place of *Peter*. There the *Punishment* is said to be the *turning the Cities into Ashes*, 2 S. Pet. 3. 6. And consequently no other *Punishment* of the *Citizens* than what was necessarily consequent to the *destruction* of their *Cities*, which had an *end* with the *Cities* themselves, and therefore could not reach the *Age* of the *Apostles*. It is added further: That they were made *an ensample* unto those that after should live ungodly. This also shews that the *Punishment* here spoken of, could not be meant of the *Apostles* Age. The Persons, to whom S. *Jude* applies his discourse, were his then contemporary *Gnosticks*. The *Apostle* therefore, and his *Contemporaries*, must live after this *Punishment*, which was design'd as an *example* for them. Nor could that *Punishment* have been *exemplary*, if it had not been before them for whose *Terror* it was designed. No, nor unless it had been publickly notified before the *Time* of those who were in danger of following so pernicious an *Example*, and who were therefore to be deterred from following it by the *exemplary Punishment* of those who had shewn them so dangerous an *Example*. But how can we imagine this notification made, but by the *Scriptures* of the *Old Testament*, which mention both the

37.

Nor could
it be Hell
Fire which
S. *Jude* (in
the Case of
the Sodomites)
calls eternal
Fire.

Sin

Sin of the *Sodomites*, and their *Punishment* too : but have not one word of any further *Punishment* they were afterwards to suffer in the *days* of the *Apostles*? What was then could not be known but by a new *Divine Revelation*, which could have no influence on the Senses of the Persons then living, but only on their *Faith* ; and therefore could be no great *Terror* to those whom the *Apostle* himself supposes *unfaithful*. But the *Belief* of the *Old Testament* was already received and settled, even in these *Infidels* themselves, and confirmed by an *Education* in favour of it. This therefore might securely *Reason* from, even against them, notwithstanding their *Infidelity*. And it is accordingly the custom of the *Writers* of the *New Testament*, as they suppose the *Old Testament* in general to be designed by Providence, for the instruction and warning of their own Age ; so to ground the *Notification* of those *Old Testament Examples* on their being written, and the warning given by them on their being written long before the Persons who were to be instructed and warned by them : not on any *New Revelation* made to themselves, not discoverable in the *Letter* of the *Old Testament* it self. Not when they have to do with Persons better affected to their Authority than the *Gnosticks* concerned in this Epistle. So *Whatsoever things were written aforetime*

ere written for our learning, Rom. 15. 4.
 γεγραπὸν is the word in both places. So
 at all the use of such Scriptures is derived
 from their being written, and written be-
 fore the Case that made the Instruction ne-
 cessary. So again: *All these things hapned*
unto them for ensamples: and they were writ-
ten for our admonition, upon whom the ends
of the world are come, 1 Cor. x. 6, 11. So in
 this very Epistle of S. Jude, the Gnosticks
 are said to be *περσελαμμένοι εἰς τὸ το καὶ*
καὶ, and that πάλαι, v. 4. In regard of the
 many antient *γεγραπὸν* mentioning the judg-
 ments of God inflicted on the like Offenders
 when referred to the Case of the Gnosticks by
 the Catholicks. And even here concerning
 the Case of the Sodomites themselves:
προκρίνται δὲ ἄνθρωποι, v. 7. Plainly referring to
 their being mentioned in the Text of the
 Old Testament, with this design of warning
 the Gnosticks of the Apostolical Age, not to
 follow their example, and of letting them
 know what they must expect, in case they did
 follow it. That is the notion of *καὶ δα*
 with *κατέκειτο* in *Athenaus*, that a word
 had been mentioned in some antient Writer.
 and accordingly *προκαὶ δα* implies its be-
 ing mentioned in the Scriptures, before the
 Case of the Gnosticks, who were to be in-
 structed by it. Exactly answering the So-
 domites being made an *ὑπόδειγμα* in S. Peter.
 The only Argument pretended by that ex-
 cel-

cellent Person, why S. Jude should mean a Punishment endured by the Sodomites when *himself* wrote, is, that the *Participle* by which it is expressed, is in the *present tense*: *περὶ αἰώνιος δίκης ὑπέχεται*. But if he had more narrowly examin'd the place, he would have found those words to be the *Nominative* Case to the *Verb* *πέχεται*. That Observation would have let him see, That the *present tense* implied in the *Participle* did not relate to the *Age* of the *Apostles*, but that rather wherein the *Cities* of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah* were destroyed by *Fire* from *Heaven*. That *Age*, I mean, mentioned by the *Scripture*, wherein they did *κείσθαι*, which that very word implies to have been *ancienter* than the *Age* of the *Apostles*. *Πέχεται ὑπέχεται* is indeed the same as *κείσθαι περὶπέχεται*, the *Preposition* being equally referred to either: That they were formerly mentioned in the *Scripture* as suffering the *Vengeance* of that *Eternal Fire* from *Heaven*; or that they had been mentioned in the same *Scriptures*, as having formerly suffered that same *Vengeance*. This will perfectly overthrow the *Inference* of that great and good Man. Yet *Philo*, Author of the *Apostles* Age, makes even that *corporal sensible Fire* which destroyed the *Sodomites*, not yet extinguished in the *time* wherein he wrote. His words are *μέχρι νῦν ὑγίεται τὸ γὰρ μέγιστον πῦρ*

ἐντυφεται ἢ νέμεται, ἢ ἐντυφεται. Πίσις
 παρὰ τὴν τὰ ὁρώμενα τῶ ᾧ συμβεβηκός.
 αὐτοὶ σημεῖον ἐστίν, ὅ, τε ἀναδιδόμενοι. Αἰεὶ
 πῶς, καὶ ὁ μεταλλενεσι δεῖον. And he imme-
 diately iubjoyns a δαῖμα (that is S. Jude's
 word) of the prosperity of those Cities in
 the City that escap'd by the intercession of
 St. Sohe, de Abrahamo, p. 370. A. Again,
 2. de vitâ Mos. καὶ μετὰ τῶ νῦν μνημεία
 συμβεβηκός. ἀλέκτε παῖδες δεικνύται κα-
 τὰ Σουραν ἐρεπία καὶ πέρεα, καὶ δεῖον καὶ καπ-
 νὸς, καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ ἀναδιδόμενη φλόξ ἀμυρεῖ, κατὰ
 διασμουχμδὺς πύρε. p. 662. A. Here is a
 possible περίκεισις which S. Jude might very
 probably allude to, of that very Fire which
 destroyed the City of Sodom, which is said
 to be Eternal, yet could be Eternal in no
 other Sense than as that which lasts as
 long as the World lasts, is said to be so.
 like the perennes fontes, and the Ever-
 lasting Mountains. So Josephus also: ἐπὶ
 ἐπὶ λέψαντα δεῖς πύρε Bell. Jud. Λογ.
 καφ. κζ. div. Græc. However, that
 temporary Fire, which destroyed the Cities
 of Sodom and Gomorrah, might so far be
 called Eternal as really typifying an Eternal
 one that was, in the later days, to destroy
 themselves, but the Gnosticks. Yet I
 confess we have a like Reasoning in the
 Orphic Book of Wisdom, which makes
 the Egyptian darkness an image of that dark-
 ness which they should afterwards receive, not
 like

like the *Rebels* against the Dispensation of the Gospel, but the *Egyptians* themselves *Wisd. xvii. 21.* Yet even that is very well accountable by our present *Hypothesis*. I see no reason why the *Sodomites* might not as well as the *Egyptians*, endure the Sufferings of the *future infernal State*, during the time of their *Duration*. That is, from the time of their *Death* to the day of *Judgment*. But I know *no* Scriptures that can be produced to prove, either that they shall suffer the Pains of the *future state* in their *Bodies*; or that they shall suffer them, even in their *Souls* for ever.

38.

The *πρόν* which is in all Men, (though it be of a Divine Original, yet) does not make us actually Immortal, but only disposes for a Union with the Spirit.

Thus far therefore I have shewn, That the *Immortalizing Principle* neither was, nor was believed in the *earliest and purest Age*, nor any Ingredient in the *nature* of the *Human Soul* as such, so as that all *Mankind* might on this account, be qualified to claim it as part of their *dues*, as *Men*. Yet I deny not but that the *Human Soul*, as *πρόν* or *flatus* was thought to be from *God*. And as it was thought to be from *God*, it was designed by him to qualify all that had it for the *preternatural State* of *Immortality* and *Happiness*, for which he had honoured the whole *Kind* with so noble an Original. *S. Paul* quotes the saying of the Heathen Poet *Aratus* with approbation: *Τὸ γὰρ ἡμεῖς θεοὶ ἐσμὲν*, *Act. xvii. 28, 29.* And he Reasoned it, as granting it *True*, concerning the *At-*

ns, to whom he was then *Preaching*, as
 ell as concerning *himself*. For even the
 eath of *Life* was inspired into *Adam* by
 d himself, *Gen. ii. 7*. And therefore com-
 municated to *all Mankind*, so far, the honour
 being descended from a *divine* Original.
 rtullian himself grants it of the *Matrix*
 ima of *Adam*, though he makes *all* the
 uls of his *Descendents* the same way be-
 ten by his *Soul*, as their *Bodies* are by his
 dy. And this *God* gave him with a *design* of
 king him *naturally* neither *Mortal* nor *Im-*
ortal; but *capable* of either, by the deter-
 nation of his own *Free-will*. If he *purged*
 nself from the Pollution of *carnal* desires,
 was put in hopes of being *Immortal* by
 e accession of the *Spirit*. If not, he was
 to his *natural Mortality*, as accordingly
 roved in the *event*. This *God* designed
 all his *Posterity* as well as *himself*, as de-
 signing to put *all* in the same advantages.
 d though his *Posterity* be *not* put in *actu-*
 possession of the *Spirit* as *he* was, yet
 e *status* they still retain, and all the *Preten-*
 ns that can give them of *qualifying* them-
 ves for a *Union* with the *Spirit*, by the use
 so much *Free-will* as can remain after the
 pulsion of the *Spirit* it self. But upon so
 ch *harder* terms, than he, as it is *harder*
 acquire the *Union* with the *Spirit*, than to
 p it when they were possessed of it, *ante-*
 nently to the use of their *own Free-will*.

M

This

This I take to be the sense of *Tatian* in the place before mentioned. So he goes on *Γέγονε μὲν ἐν συνδιαίῳ ἀρχήθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ*. That is, in the Person of *Adam* *Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ταύτην ἔπειθαι μὴ βυλομένην αὐτῷ κατὰλέλοιπεν*. This desertion of the Spirit, seems to be alluded to in the words of *Genesis*; *My Spirit shall not always strive with Man*, *Gen. vi. 3.* at least, as to the general desertion of the Spirit. *Tatian* adds *Ἡ δὲ αὖ περ ἑναυσμα τῆ δυνάμεως αὐτῆς κινήμενη, διὰ τὸ χωρισμὸν τὰ τελεῖα καθορᾶν μὴ δύναται, ζητῶσα τὸ θεόν, κατὰ πλάνην πορεύεται ἀνετύπωσεν, τοῖς ἀνίστοφιστεύουσι δαίμονα κατὰ τὴν ἐκδήσασα*. This seems to be the *light shining in the darkness*: Yet so that the darkness could not lay hold on it. That darkness himself before interpreted to be ἀνάστασις τῶν ψυχῶν. Nor can that ἑναυσμα be the Spirit it self, which he immediately after denies to be in all men. His words are very express, *Πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ θεῶ παρὰ πάντας ἐκ ἑστῆ*. What therefore can it be, but the external Irradiation of the Spirit, which being obeyed, will qualify the well disposed Souls for a Union with the Spirit it self? he; αἱ μὲν παιδόμεναι σοφία, σφῖσιν αὖ ἐφείλχοντο πνεῦμα συγγενές. He owns therefore a συγγένεια between the *νοῦς*, the Spirit it self, and the πνεῦμα, because they were originally united by God, who intended they should still have continued so in all men.

en had not been wanting to *themselves*.
 his I take to be the meaning of the *Apostle*,
 when he owns all *Human Souls*, as distinct
 from the *Spirit*, to be the *Off-spring* of *God*;
 yet so as to allow none for *Sons*, but them
 who have the *Spirit* of *Adoption*, which is
 not otherwise to be expected *now*, but in our
Christian Baptism. $\Gamma\upsilon\omicron\eta$ is enough for the
 one, but $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is requisite for the other.
 But the former alone cannot give any neces-
 sary *Right* to the other, but only a *Capacity*.
 As all *Free-born* Persons are capable of the
 highest Offices in a *Society*, which notwith-
 standing are not *many*, and therefore can
 be enjoyed only by a few.

But the way how the former may qualifie
 for the latter, as it is little observed now,
 it is necessary to be further explained.
 But from the *Notions* and *Reasonings* of the
 best and purest Ages. It is certain that, as
 there was no claim from *Humane Nature* in
 general, that could entitle all men to this
supernatural Principle of the *Spirit*; so nei-
 ther was there any *Promise*, or *Divine Re-*
velation, that *God* would be pleased to give
 that to all men, which none could challenge
 in any other Title. No *Covenant* after
Adam with *Mankind* in general, that every
individual should have it restored to them,
 since they had lost their claim by the *Co-*
venant with *Adam*. No *Divine Covenant*
 with any particular *Nation*, but the *Old*

39.

No ordi-
 nary means
 suited for
 conveying
 the Spirit
 before the
 Gospel.

Peculium, till the *New Covenant* by *Christ*. Nor any *Covenant*, even with the *Jews* themselves, expressly relating to their *Souls* and the *Life to come*, so far from any express *Stipulation* for the *Spirit*. No *Sacramental Symbol* then for conveying it to any as a *Principle* of a *New* or *Diviner Life* which was the only consideration that could entitle the *Receiver* to *Immortality*. The *Spirit* that was then conveyed by the *Symbol* of *Unction*, was plainly of another kind relating to *Gifts* rather than *Graces* of the *Spirit*; and *Gifts* of a lower kind, relating principally to *publick Offices* in this *Life*, and therefore principally for the good *Administration* of the *Visible Body* rather than the *Personal Benefit* of the *Receiver*. Till conveying it by a *Covenanting Symbol* to be received by every particular *Member*, and a *Principle* of *Divine Life*, is the peculiar *Prerogative* of the *Gospel*. And since the *Ordinary way* of conveying it is settled, and settled by a *Divine Establishment*, and that for ever; there is no reason why any should expect it, who uses not the ordinary visible means appointed by *God*, for receiving it. No more than *Naaman* could pretend to a cure of his *Leprosie*, by *Waters* besides those of *Jordan*, after *God* had been pleased to confine his own favour to that particular *River*. But before the *Confinement* of the *Gospel*, the limitation

of the *Old Peculium* seemed principally to
 relate to the Favours of *this Life*; as their
Civil Government was a *Theocracy*, and as
 they might hope to *over-rule* the Interests
 of *other Nations*, by having a more *potent*
Numen, whenever their *Interests* should be
inconsistent. Their Plea therefore to the
Spirit on this account, was no other than
 that the *Spirit* was the *ordinary* Administra-
 tion under the *Supreme Being*. And no
 other could, on this account, lay any *claim*
 to the *Spirit*, than as they were concerned
 in the Administration of the *Civil Govern-*
ment. So their *Princes* were; and their
Priests, as they were principally privileged
 with the Oracle of *Urim*, and the Care of
Jealousie, and the miraculous *Cures* of Le-
prosy, and the *Expiation* of *Peculiar Sins*,
 which might bring *temporal* Judgments on
 the *whole Body*; and their *Prophets* also, as
 employed on *Divine Messages*, or *consulted*
 in their *Temporal Affairs*. All these, if
 they ever meddled with any thing relating
 to the *Future Life*: it was but *occasionally*,
 and beyond the *Expectation* of the Dispen-
 sation then obtaining. But these Claims
 were all grounded on the *Offices*, rather
 than the *Vertues*, of the *Persons* who then
 received the *Spirit*. And were only of
 use more necessary for the *Publick*, than
 designed for the *Personal* benefit of those
 who had the *Gifts*. These therefore can

have nothing to do with the *Inhabitation* of the *Spirit*, as a *new Principle* of a *Divine Immortal Life*, which was never intended to be *confined* to *Offices*, but was by God originally *designed* as a *Reward* of *Personal Vertue*, even in *Adam* himself, and therefore in all his descending *Posterity*. *Prophetick Instinct*, and *Divinatory Dreams* and *Occasional Afflation*, were *sufficient* for those ends of *Government*, which require no *constant* *Inhabitation*, much less an *Animation*, of the *Diviner Spirit*. That therefore which might contribute to the receiving the *Spirit* thus understood, in order to the *advancing*, and *immortalizing* the *Nature* of the *Person* who received it, must be something *common* to all the *Members* of that *Peculium*, and wherein none might be able to plead any *Prerogative* above his *Brethren*, but what might be imputable to his better *use* of those same *Endowments* which were *common* to their whole *Body*. That could be no other but the *common Discipline* of the *Dispensation* under which they lived. For there was *that Revelation* concerning God's *design* of *rewarding* all particular *Members* to that *highest* all *Favours* of which their *Nature* was capable of receiving the *Spirit* as a *Principle* of a *new Life*, distinct from the *Covenant* made with *Adam*, who had *forfeited* it for *himself* and his *Posterity*. And it is

ain, by the *Revelations* of the *New Testa-*
ment, That it was *not* thus *actually* given to
any *then*. Because it was the *Office* of the
same *Ady* who was the *second Adam*, the
Man from Heaven, who gave the *Spirit* to
Adam himself, that he could alone renew
the *Spirit* to his fallen *Posterity*. All there-
fore that could be done *then*, was to *quali-*
fy themselves, as to those *dispositions* which
were in their *Power*, for receiving the *Spiri-*
t, when the appointed *season* should come
for giving it. One *qualification* God had
given them, without their own contribu-
tion; that is, That they were all born of
the *Patriarchal Seed*, and descended from
those *Ancestors* to whom God had made *Pro-*
mises, and entred into *Covenants* for them-
selves and their *Posterity*. And, though
the *Spirit* was no *particular* Article of these
Covenants on God's part; yet their being
chosen for God's *particular* Care and *Patro-*
nage, made them the most likely *Candidates*
for *unknown* arbitrary *Favours*; even such
Favours also, as had *not* been originally
designed for all who participated in the same
common Human Nature, as this was. But
as they were of the *Patriarchal Seed*, they
were *incorporated* into that *Body*, of which
our Lord himself was the *Head*, and conse-
quently were entitled to all the *Purchases*
of his *Blood*, though themselves did not
then know it. And among them the *Prin-*

cipal was the Spirit. But whether Rebels among them should be immortalized to Punishment, may not possibly seem altogether so clear. Yet there is rather reason to believe they might. Their Theocratical Government, even then, was believed to be under the administration of the אֱלֹהִים immediately, whose Spirit it was, that had so great a share in the subordinate Administration under him. As therefore his Spirit is said to have been grieved by those Rebels so Christ is said to have been tempted by them. And he is said to have been afflicted in all their Afflictions, on account of his Sympathy resulting from his Matrimonial Union with them. For the אֱלֹהִים, not the Father, was supposed to have the Schechinah, which made him capable of conversing with Man kind. Thus their Rebellion against the Theocracy, under which they lived then, may make them responsible to our Blessed Lord as committed against his Person, and as properly reflecting on him, who is to be the Judge, and as he was the Angel of the Covenant, and the Legislator of the Decalogue, as well as their other written Law. But this was common to them all, and only qualified them conditionally, if they observed the Ceremonial Expiations prescribed by the Law it self, which God was pleased to accept as Expedients for promoting that Purity of Mind which was requisite to qualify them

em for a *Union* with his *own Divine Spi-*
 This was in their *own* power, and on
 is depended the *Event*, as to *particular*
 rsons, as to the *entitling* them particu-
 ly to the *Rewards* or *Punishments* of the
 dispensation respectively. Yet even this
 one was *not* thought sufficient for attaining
 the *Spirit*. It was to be attained by the
 Dispensation, no otherwise, than as
 observing it, entitled those who did so,
 the *Benefits* of the *New*, among which
 is of the *Spirit* was the *Principal*.
 This therefore being given only by the
 Dispensation, could not be expected,
 any who lived under the *old* Dispensa-
 on, on any other *Terms*, but those of the
 w. And the *general* Condition, required
 from *all* by that, is *Belief*. This our *Bles-*
 ed Lord declares, as the *Rule* of his Pro-
 cedure in that *Judgment*, by which he in-
 tends to adjudge *Eternal Rewards* and
Eternal Punishments, that *he that believes*
and is baptized, shall be saved; and that he
who believes not, shall be damned. The
Baptism is that of the *Spirit*, which is that
 which must *immortalize*. And the *Just*
 himself cannot expect to *live*, that is, this
Immortal Life by his *Justice*, that is, by his
 al observing of the *old Law*, but by his
 ith prescribed by the *new*. But, as the
 apostle reasons, *Faith comes by hearing,*
 om. x. 16, 17. which he gathered from
 Is. iii. 1.

40.
 Faith is
 (by the
 Terms of
 the Gos-
 pel) requi-
 site for re-
 ceiving the
 Immorta-
 lizing Spi-
 rit.

If. liii. 1. The *Word*, we there translate *report*, is in the Greek *ἀνῆν*. Thence the *ἀνῆν πῖστος*, Gal. iii. 2, 5. That therefore the deceased Members of the old *Peculium* might be qualified for the Benefits of the *new*, it was requisite they should believe the *Gospel*; and, in order thereunto, it was withal as requisite that they should hear it. This therefore was by the *Antients* believed to be the Cause of our Blessed Lord's Descent into *Hell*, as *Hell* is taken for the common *Receptacle* of Souls, both good and bad; that is, that he might there preach the *Gospel* to them, who never heard of it while they were on Earth, to qualify them for their final Sentence by their Faith or Disbelief of it. The Testimonies

Clem. Al.
Str. ii. 8
Strom. vi.
Origen
contr. Cels.
l. ii.

Clemens Alexandrinus and *Origen*, are very plain and full to this Purpose, not now mentioning the more numerous ones of *later* Ages, which (I know) will be less regarded. The Foot-steps of this Opinion are so unanimous, and so near the *Apostolical* Original, and so agreeable to the *Principles* and *Reasonings* of the *Apostolical* Ages, and so uncontradicted by any Monuments of those *Times*; that it is hard to conceive how they could have any other Origin than *Apostolical*. I shall mention only some of the most antient.

Such is that *Eph. v. 14. Wherefore he* 41.
with, awake thou that sleepest, and arise from Therefore
the Dead, and Christ shall give thee Light. the An-
 This is the same with the *Immortal Life,* tients
John i. 4. And it is an Address to the (even of
 Dead, who are frequently said to *sleep,* in the Apo-
 the Prophetical Style of the *New Testament;* stical
 and the *Light* seems to allude to the *Bap-* Age) be-
ismal Illumination of the *Spirit,* upon lieved,
 owning the true *Faith.* Such is that also that our
 of *S. Peter, 1 Eph. iii. 18, 19, 20. Christ* Saviour
 hath also once suffered for Sin, the just for preached
 the unjust (that he might bring us to God) to the se-
 being put to Death in the Flesh, but quickned parate
 by the Spirit: by which also he went and Souls of
 reached unto the Spirits in Prison; which those who
 sometimes were disobedient, when once the deceased
 long-suffering of God waited in the days of before his
 Noah. The *Spirit* here cannot be the *Spiri-* Incarna-
 tion.
 tion of *Christ* in *Noah* or any other *Patriarch*
 then living, but the *Spirit* of *Christ* himself
 who is here said to have been the *Preacher.*
 That very *Spirit* wherein he *lived* at the
 same time wherein he was *alive,* at the same
 time that he was put to *Death* in the *Flesh;*
 that *Spirit* which is elsewhere *opposed* to his
Flesh, 1 Tim. iii. 16. That *Spirit* which is
 ascribed to him as the *second Adam,* and
 the *Lord from Heaven,* and which is called
 a *quickning Spirit, 1 Cor. xv. 45.* as being
 at self *uncapable* of dying, and as being a
 Principle of *Life* to all others that partake
 of

of it. Nothing could be more properly mentioned on this occasion, than that *Spirit* in which he might be present with them, though *absent* in the *Flesh*, 1 Cor. 3 Col. ii. 5. Than that *Spirit*, which, upon their *Belief* of his *Preaching*, was to be given them also in its *First-fruits*, in its earnest as a *pledge* of their *Immortality*, and a *Principle* by which it was to be conferred. Nor could this *Preaching* in his *Spirit* agree at any time so conveniently, as that when with it is here joyned, when he was put to *Death in the Flesh*; that is, to the space between his *Death* and *Resurrection*. And the words, *sometime disobedient*, plainly imply that their *Disobedience* was long before the time wherein they were preached to. And his *Preaching* is plainly distinguished from the *Preaching* of *Noah*, the *Preacher* of *Righteousness*, 2 S. Pet. ii. 5. That time of *Noah* is said here to be the time of the *long suffering* of *God*, wherein 120 Years were allowed them for a *respite*, Gen. vi. 3. and is opposed to this *new Preaching* of *Christ*, when in there was no such *respite* granted, no such *Argument* of *long-suffering*, but the final *Answer*, whether they would believe was expected within the space between the *Death* of our *Lord* and his *Resurrection*. Here was the fittest season for visiting the *Patriarchs* in the same *Spirit*, which was to restore them that *Spirit*, as a security for their *Immortality*.

mortality, which was *withdrawn* from
 m generally in those days of *Noah*, when
 expressly warned them that his *Spirit*
could not always strive with men. This seems
 relate to the *Image of God* restored to *See Disc.*
 b after the Fall of his *Father*, which was *of Marri-*
 taken away from their *Body* till this *age, &c.*
 e. The Children of *Cain* had long be-
 e lost their *Title* to it, not only on ac-
 nt of *Adam*, but also of *Cain* himself,
 o never *had* the *Spirit* himself, that he
 ight *derive* it to his *Posterity*. And the
 pture it self supposes this to have been
 Case, when it calls the *Sons of Seth* on-
 the *Sons of God*, and the *Daughters of*
 n the *Daughters of Men*, because it is this
 rit of *Adoption* which entitles us, even
 he *new Peculium*, to the honourable style
 being the *Sons of God*. So again the
 e *S. Peter*, iv. 6. *For this cause was the*
 pel preached also to them that are dead,
 t they might be judged according to Men
 he *Flesh*, but live according to God in the
 rit. Here it is plain, that the *Spirits*
 Prison are the departed *Souls* of them
 o were then *dead* when the *Gospel* was
 ched to them; and therefore that the
 aching cannot be understood of the
 aching of *Noah*, or of any other Person
 o preached to them while they were yet
 e. It appears also that the *design* of this
 aching was, that they might *live*. A
 Life

Life undoubtedly that was no *necessary* consequent of their own *Nature*, and which they could not have had but by the benefit of this *Preaching*, and the *Flexibility* of their own *Wills*, by which they might be enabled to *receive* the *Benefit* of this *Preaching*. And this agrees with the words: *that they might be judged according to Men in the flesh*. The meaning could not be, that this *Preaching*, which was designed for *entitling* the dead Persons to *Life*, could give Men the *living* any *Reason* to *judge* those as still in the *Flesh*, who were punished in the *Delay*. But rather that notwithstanding Men the *living* were possessed with *hard* thoughts of the *final* state of those who perished in the time of *Noah*; yet, by the *benefit* of this *Preaching*, many should be found entitled to this *Immortality*, which was the *Privilege* of the new *Peculium*. The Expression, though it may seem strange, is yet exactly parallel to that of *S. Paul*, *God be thanked, though ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine which delivered you, Rom. vi. 17.* That they had been the *servants* of *Sin*, could be no reason of thanks to *God*, but rather that was followed in the *Apodosis*: that, though they had been formerly the *servants* of *sin*, they had now obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine which was delivered to them. this censorious Judgment of Men here,

ses the *Preaching* to have been to them
 their *separate state*, because the good
 of it was *unknown*, and therefore could
 no restraint to *censorious* Persons who
 saw *nothing* but the *hopeless* condition of
 their entrance on the state of *Separation*.
 Like passage is preserved by *S. Justin Mar-*
tyr and *Irenæus*, so antient *then* as to be
 ascribed to either *Jeremiah* or *Isaiah*. The
 words are these: Ἐμνήσθη ὁ κύριος ὁ θεός
 τῶν νεκρῶν ὡς τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γλῶσσαν
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελισαῖν
 αὐτοὺς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτῶν. *S. Justin* charges
 the *Jews* with cutting these words out of
 the *Prophecy of Jeremiah*. So in the *La-*
zar Book of *Ecclesiasticus*: Penetrabo omnes
 superiores partes terræ, & inspiciam omnes
 dormientes, & illuminabo omnes sperantes in
 domino, xxiv. 45. These are so early *Au-*
thorities, and so esteemed by them who
 lived in the *next Age* to the *Apostles*, that
 it is hardly possible that they could be in-
 consistent with the *then* notorious *Traditions*.
 But, being plain *Consequences* from these
 principles now proved *Catholic*, they can
 hardly be otherwise than *Catholic* them-
 selves. Nor would it have been mention'd
 in so many *Creeds*, unless the *Churches* that
 inserted them, had thought them of
 more *Consequence* and *Authority* than *private*
opinions. And the *literal Sense* of the
 descent into *Hell*, is that which has al-
 ways

S. Justin,
Dial. cum
Tryphon.
p. 298.
S. Iren. l.
iii. 23.
iv. 39, 45.
56, 66.
v. 26.

ways had the greatest *Aathority*. As in our own Church, we still retain the Clause of the *Te Deum* that favours it: *When thou hadst overcome the Sharpness of Death, thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all Believers*. It is plainly here said to be, when our Saviour had overcome the Sharpness of Death, which exactly agrees to the Space between his Death and Resurrection. That it was, when he was in "Adns, that he opened the Kingdom of Heaven to those who believed, in the place where himself was. That is, who believed in "Adns. But they could not believe without a Preacher, Rom. x. 14. He must therefore preach in "Adns. Here therefore the Kingdom of Heaven was opened to the deceased in "Adns, on the terms now mentioned, of Faith. And in our first Articles, in Edw. the Sixth's time, our Church was express for a local Descent, and quoted for it the forementioned Passage of S. Peter, in the Article it self. Though she has since been pleased to forbear imposing it, in the later Edition under Queen Elizabeth.

42. Besides, by the Terms of the Gospel, Baptism is necessary, as well as Faith, recovering our lost Immortality. Our Saviour's words are very express: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. (Mark 16:16) Water Baptism also necessary (by the Gospel) for receiving the Spirit, which therefore the Antients believed to have been given to the separate Souls of them who had no hope of attaining it when living.

believ

lieveth, and is baptized, shall be saved,
 Mark xvi. 16. Faith alone therefore is not
 efficient Security for this Salvation. So
 baptism is said to save us, 1 S. Pet. iii. 21.
 and not only the Baptism of the Spirit, as
 the immediate Principle of Immortality, but
 the Baptism of Water also, as the only ordi-
 nary means appointed by Christ for obtain-
 ing the Spirit. In this also, our Saviour's
 words are very exprefs: *Verily, Verily, I say*
unto thee, except a man be born of water and
of the spirit, he cannot enter into the king-
dom of God, S. Joh. iii. 5. This therefore is
 another Reason of Preaching to such separate
 souls as had not, before death, heard of our
 blessed Lord and his Gospel, that they might
 not only be converted to a Belief of him,
 but be Baptized also. And that even with
 the Baptism of Water. So the Aposto-
 lical Hermas: * *Quare de profundo hi lapides* * L. iii.
descenderunt, & positi sunt in structuram turris Similitud.
 ix. n. 16.
us; cum jam pridem portaverint Spiritus
sanctos? Neceffe est, inquit, ut per aquam ha-
berent ascendere, ut requiescant. Non pote-
rat enim aliter in regnum Dei intrare quàm
deponerent mortalitatem prioris vite. Illi
autem defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt,
et intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam
accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti
condemnatu est; at ubi accipit illud sigillum,
liberatur à morte, & traditur vite. Illud au-
tem sigillum aqua est in quam descendunt ho-
 mines

mines morti obligati, ascendunt verò vite
 assignati : & illis igitur prædicatum est illud
 sigillum ; & usi sunt eo, ut intrarent in reg-
 num Dei. Et dixi : Quare ergò, Domine, illi
 quadraginta lapides ascenderunt cum illis de
 profundo jam habentes illud sigillum ? Et
 dixit : Quoniam hi Apostoli & Doctores, qui
 prædicaverunt nomen Filii Dei, cum, habentes
 fidem ejus & potestatem, defuncti essent
 prædicaverunt his qui ante obierunt, & in-
 dederunt eis illud signum, κηρύγμα. [what
 follows, is from Clemens Alexandrinus
 κατέβησαν ἐν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πάλιν
 ἀνέβησαν. Ἀλλ' ἔτοι ζῶντες κατέβησαν, καὶ
 πάλιν ζῶντες ἀνέβησαν ὁκαῖνοι ὅ, οἱ προκεκο-
 μημένοι, νεκροὶ κατέβησαν, ζῶντες ὅ ἀνέβησαν.
 Διὰ τούτων ἐν ἐξωποιοήθησαν, καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν
 τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὰ τέτο καὶ συνανέβησαν
 μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ συνήρμωσαν εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομήν
 τοῦ πύργου, καὶ ἀλατῶμήτοι συνακοδομήθησαν
 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὁκοιμέθησαν καὶ ἐν μεγάλῃ ἀγνείᾳ
 μόνον ὅ τὴν σφραγίδα ταύτην ἐκ ἔχον. We
 see here that neither the great Exactness
 in observing the Law prescribed them (that is
 is their δικαιοσύνη) nor their Abstinence from
 Pollutions, Legal or Mystical, (that is the
 ἀγνεία) was thought sufficient to entitle
 those to this immortal Life, who died before
 our Saviour's Incarnation, without an ex-
 plicit Faith in him, and Baptism, even the use
 of Water also, in order to their further Purifi-
 cation, and to the entitling them to the Spirit

Spirit. This, very probably, might be the Reason of the *Præctice* alluded to by the *Apostle*, of *Baptizing for the Dead*, 1 Cor. xv. 29. It might have been, on these *Principles*, for *known Believers* who had *qualified* themselves for all the Favours of the *Gospel*, by *living* suitably to the *Faith* professed by them, but had, by some Providence, unavoidable by *Human Diligence*, been taken away *before* they had received the Sacrament of *Baptism*, and might therefore be believed to have a very just *Title* to the *Equity* of the *Baptismal Covenant*, though they had none by the *Letter* of it. In this Case they might hope to *entitle* such rightly dispos'd Persons (who wanted nothing requisite on their own parts, that *was*, or ever *had been*, in their own power) by putting them into *possession* of it, as far as they were able *then*, in the Persons of their *Susceptors*, or *Stipulators*, which the *Law* allowed in many Cases, where the Duty to be performed was not perfectly *inseparable* from the *Person*. This might especially be presumed, when the *deceased* Person had received the *Spirit* immediately on his *Conversion*, and before his *Baptism*, and had withal *external Evidences* of his having received it, in visible *Schechinahs*, and the gift of *Tongues*, and such other proofs as might satisfy, even *Unbelievers*, as they did *Simon Magus*, even when he was in the

gall of bitterness. This was not unfrequent then, I am apt to think it was *usual* in the first Conversions of a Province, and especially in the Case of the first Converts in it. And the Reasoning of the Apostle from it, seems to suppose it in this very place of the Epistle to the Corinthians. He speaks of such a Baptism as could have no effect but upon the Body, and which therefore could have no effect, if the Body of him who had been initiated by it, should not rise; that is, of such a Baptism which could have no other effect, but that of making them one Body with Christ. Such that Baptism must be, which was administered to them who were already one Spirit with Christ, by their having actually received his Spirit. To such there remained no other Union that could be ascribed to their latter Baptism, but the Bodily one, by their being Baptized into the one Body of Christ, which is true only of the Water Baptism, in contradistinction to the Baptism of the Spirit. And indeed his whole Reasoning proceeds only on that Baptism which made them one Body with Christ. The Consequences will not hold otherwise, that if Christ's Body was raised, theirs must be raised also: Nor, on the contrary, That if their Bodies should not rise, they could not truly own the raising of the Body of Christ. Both Arguments suppose them one Body with Christ; that is, in a Mystical Sense

Members of his *Body*, of his *Flesh*, and of his *Bones*, as the same Apostle does elsewhere express it. And this seems to have been the Reasoning of those *Hereticks*, against whom the Apostle here disputes. They pretended the *Resurrection* was past already, 2. *Tim.* ii. 18. Their meaning seems to have been, not, as it would now be popularly understood, as if a bare change of *Manners*, a rising from *sin* to *newness* of *Life*, had been all the *Resurrection* that was promised by the *Christian Religion*: But that the *Resurrection* was the *winging* of the *Soul*, by which it was enabled, when it pleased, to mount again to *Heaven*, where it was supposed to have been *originally* before its fall into the *Body*. For this *Wing* the Christians called the *Spirit*, which was given in the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*. This was pure *Platonism*, and generally the sense of those *Philosophers* who were for *Religion*, and agreed with them in particulars of this kind. But then these *Philosophers* were not concerned what became of the *Body*, because they thought it *pænal* and *præternatural* to the *Soul*. They would therefore have taken the *immortalizing* the *Body* for a design of *perpetuating* its *Exile* and *Punishment*, rather than of reducing it to its *primitive* and most *perfect* State. This made the *Christian Doctrine* of the *Resurrection* of the *Body* so unacceptable to the *learned* of those

Ages, and the contrary Doctrine so *pleasing* to the *Hereticks*, who were more influenced by the *Authority* of the *Philosophers* than of our Blessed *Saviour* and his *Apostles*. And the ground of that Opinion was, that those *Philosophers* believed the *Soul* naturally *Immortal*. Thence it was obvious for them to infer, that such *Bodies* as ours are, that are fitted with *Organs* proper for restoring the *decays* of the *Individuals*, and for *perpetuating* the *Species* by the production of new *Individuals*, could not be *natural* to it, because both those kinds of *Organs* suppose the *Mortality* of the *Individuals*. For confuting therefore of this received Opinion, it was very proper to shew that *Christ* had raised his *own Body*, and therefore did not believe it *praternatural*, or *inconsistent* with the perfect *Happiness* of his *exalted State*. This he proves by that *Topick* (which, in that *near Memory* of the *Fact*, was most proper for a Subject of that Nature) of the *Testimony* of those who had *seen* him after his *Resurrection*, most of whom were still *living*, and might yet be consulted by them who doubted of it. This therefore being granted, he proves further, that the *Christian Sacraments* were designed to make us *one Body* with him, as well as *one Spirit*. Thence it followed, that if his *glorified State* required a *Body*, ours must do so too: And therefore that the *contrary Doctrine* ruined the

the credit of all those initiatory Rites by which they had been made *Christians*, which were purposely designed to assure them, that their *Bodies* should share in their *immortal* Happiness, and therefore must themselves be made *immortal* also, v. 14, 15. Accordingly he shews in 2 *Tim.* ii. 18. that it had this effect on some, that it made them abandon the profession of *Christianity* it self, as renouncing all their pretensions to *Divine Revelation* suspicious to those who more firmly believed the *inconsistency* of the *Corporeal* state with *Cælestial* Happiness, than the *Testimony* of those upon whose *Credit* they had received their *Christianity* it self. This I take to be the importance of those words, and overthrow the Faith of some. For had it been only a denial by *Consequence* of what they owned by their *Communion*; it must have overthrown the *Faith*, not of some only, but of all who believed that *Doctrine*. But to those who were more perswaded of the *Truth* of *Christianity* than of that *Doctrine*, it was very proper for the *Apostle* to urge this avowed *Practice* of the *Church*. And the rather, because he seems to suppose it so generally receiv'd, as that some of his *Adversaries* had been concerned in it, not considering how inconsistent it was with their new *Heresie*, I mean that of *Baptizing* those with a design of thereby securing them from *Death*, who could not (by their own

Principles) be in danger of any other *Death* besides that of the *Body*, as being already secure of the *Spirit*. This was certainly the case of *Cornelius*, who was *baptized* with *Water*, notwithstanding he had already received the *Spirit*. It is not therefore a *Personal mistake* on which he reasons in this *Case*, as is commonly conceived. This *Apostolick* Author shews that this *Baptism* of *Water*, was thought as necessary to secure from *Death*, as that of the *Spirit*. Hence therefore we understand, how *necessary* it was (by the *Principles* even of that *pure* Age) that the *separate* Souls of their *Predecessors* should have *Baptism* of *Water* as well as *Faith*, for securing them of the *Resurrection* of their *Bodies*. I know it will be thought strange, how *separate* Souls could receive *Corporeal Baptism*. And very probably it would have been thought strange *then* as *now*, if the *Doctrine* had been the same *then* as *now*, concerning the *spiritual Nature* of the *separate Soul*. But as they *then* thought the *Souls* incapable of receiving any impression from *Fire* without some degree of *Corporeity*; so the same *Body* that qualified them for *Fire* might make them capable of *Lustrations* by *Water* also. Indeed *Lustrations* by *Fire* and *Water* were usual in their *Mysteries*, and were thought beneficial by *Plato* for clearing themselves from the *βόβοι*, the *corporeal* pestiferous

as *Virgil* calls them, that *hindred* their ascent to *Heaven*. And *Water* particularly was made use of in their annual *Februa* to the *Dii manes* on the first of *Februa*, which Month receives its Name from that Solemnity, which *Tertullian* seems to intimate to have been taken up by the *Hereticks*. This shews how inclinable the *Christians* were to entertain the same Notions of their *Baptism*, where they had no warning given them to the contrary by any Revelation of the *Gospel*, which is not so much as pretended in this Case.

There was also a *third* condition requisite to qualify, even *separate Souls*, for the benefits of *Christianity*. That is, an actual and explicit *Repentance* of their *Idolatry* and worship of *Devils*, for those who had been actually guilty of it, how well soever they meant, when that was their Case. Other were purged by a general *Repentance* on their first initiation into the Church by their *baptismal Washing*, without any particular satisfaction for what was past. But as *Communion* with the *Devil* made them members of that *Body*, of which the *Devil* was the *Head*, which their *baptismal Profession* obliged them expressly to renounce, before they could be received into that new mystical *Body* of which our *Blessed Saviour* was the *Head*. This therefore was requisite to be their own express Act, and Personal,

43.
Renunciation of the Devil necessary for the Spirit, which was also believed performable in the separate state, by those who could not know their Duty before.

as

as those had been of their *Communion* with the *Devil*, by which they had entitl'd themselves to *share* in that *Fire*, which was *not* prepared for *them*, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*; and for them no *otherwise* than as they had, by their *own* Act, made their *own* Cause the same with *his*. But when they *had* done so, it was, in *reason*, to be expected that they should, by the like *express* Acts of their own, rescind what they had done formerly, in order to the *disengaging* themselves from the pernicious *Consequences* to which they had thereby made themselves obnoxious. Till they had done so, they were incapable of that *Communion* with *Christ*, which was to entitle them to the benefits of his *Death*, and the *Life* and *Immortality* purchased by it. I easily foresee how apt our *Adversaries* are to make the Case of *separate* Souls extraordinary, and therefore accountable by no other means but such as are, like the Case it self, extraordinary also. And so there may indeed be *reason* to reckon it as to what is *Extraordinary* in it, that *Overtures* should be made to them in the state of actual *Separation*. That must *not* indeed be *expected* by them who have had the *Gospel* sufficiently notified to them while they were in their *Bodies*. Their determination *here* must conclude then for ever. That may make their Case *seem* Extraordinary, if our *present* Case

en for the *Standard* of what is *Ordinary*.
 otherwise, if the *Rule* of the *greatest num-*
 be taken for the *Ordinary Rule*, that
 perhaps, have as good a *Title* to the
 of *Ordinary* as *ours*. It is reasonable
 believe, that it was as *constant* in all who
 d before our Saviour's *Incarnation*, as
 is in all who lived *since* the publica-
 of the *Gospel*, who *heard* of it. And
 numbers of those who lived in so many
 generations before, must needs be greater than
 numbers of those who lived *since*, and
 of the *Gospel*. It must therefore have
 n, at least, as *ordinary* a *Rule* then, as
 is now. However this is very reason-
 that, seeing the *future immortal Cæ-*
Life, and the *Spirit* as the *cause* of it,
 only attainable by the *Gospel*; they
 ld be attained by the *means* and *qualifi-*
 y, prescrib'd by the *Gospel*. Nor can
 be denied but that these three, of *Faith*
Water-Baptism, and *Renunciation* of
 past *νομινα* with the *Devil*, the capi-
Adversary of our Saviour, are plainly
 oled and required by the *Constitution*
 e new *Peculium*. And equitable *Dis-*
 tions with the known *Laws* of a *Society*,
 never designed by *Legislators* but for
 Cases which *cannot* be provided for by
 al *Rules*, and wherein therefore *few*
 ons may be *concerned*. To do other-
 would encourage *breaches* of the *Law*,
 if

if very many might expect the favour of the Legislator, and that ordinarily, and in common. Much more if the numbers of such Favours were greater than of those who lay claim to his favour in the ordinary and allowed way of gaining his Favour, that of keeping Commandments. It would be a reflection on the Wisdom and the foresight of the Legislator, to leave great numbers destitute of the Rule to go by. And much more so, if there were more who might expect the protection and favour of his Society, in the notorious breach of his Laws, than in observing them. Other Secular Governments do indeed secure their main ends, if they can secure the performance of their Laws by their Subjects *this* Life, at least, as to a majority of the Subjects. The reason is, because all Duties to such Societies expire with *this* Life, beyond which the Rewards and Punishments do not extend. But that is not the Case of Souls, whose main concern relates to *future* Life, and to *this* Life no other than as their behaviour *here* may contribute to the Happiness or Infelicity of the *Future* State. It is therefore very agreeable that even separate Souls should be obliged to comply with the means prescribed by the Gospel, in order to the attaining that Immortality which was not otherwise attainable than by the Gospel. This therefore is another inducement to make the *Fact* ap-

ible, which is otherwise so well at-
ed by witnesses of that Apostolical Age.

Thus therefore it appears, that *separate* 44.
s of Persons who dyed *before* the Incar- tiles also
on, received the *immortalizing* Prin- are owned
e in their *separate* State; and that this by Hermas
actually *believed* in those *earliest* times. to have re-
Legi ens observes further, from this passage ceived the
e of Hermas, that others as well as Jews, Spirit by
if the allowed the *Benefit* as well as *Favour* our Savi-
otect. His words are: 'Ο ποιμὴν ὁ ἀπλῶς tism in
otori πρὸ κηρυγμῆνόν σεῖς τῶν λέξιν, δικαίως οἶδε their sepa-
g the ἐν ἔθνεσι καὶ ἐν Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ μόνον πρὸ τῶ rate State.

and sec. καὶ ἐν παρυσίαις, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ νόμου, καὶ ἅ
the πρὸς θεόν εὐαρέσῃσιν, ὡς Ἀβελ, ὡς Νῶε,
objects καὶ πῖς ἑτέρῳ δικαίῳ. Strom. ii. p. 163.

of the mas makes no express mention of *Abel*
all Da *Noah*. But the words alluded to by

Life, ens are these: *Decem, qui in fundamen-*
ment collocati sunt, primum seculum est. Sequen-

Cafe viginti quinque secundum seculum est justorum

es to rum, L. iii. Simil. ix. n. 15. The first *Ten*

other the *Ante-diluvian* Patriarchs, among

ontrib from *Abel* may be reckoned to fill up the

ne Fa ber, if *Adam* be excluded, who first

able cited the Spirit. For so he adds after-

obliged ds: *Hi primi Spiritus illos portaverunt,*
d by *omnino alius ab alio non recesserunt, nec*
at Im *spiritus ab hominibus, nec homines à Spiri-*
attain ; *sed juncti fuerunt hi Spiritus eis*
re is *ad diem quietis: qui, nisi hos Spiritus*
et ap *habuissent, non fuissent utiles structuræ*
c *turris*

turris hujus. This was not true of Adam but of the rest it was ; because the Desert of the Spirit from the generality of Mankind was first in the days of Noah, as I have already observed. And the *justi* of the second *Seculum* are the Persons alluded to by *Clemens* in the words, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. These are the Persons alluded to by S. Paul in *Heb. xi.* and commended by him on account of their having pleased God by Faith. v. 5. Plainly in opposition to the Law ; and therefore on the same Terms with the Gentiles under the new *Peculium*. And he urges, for this purpose, their living before the Law, meaning, not only the Law of Moses, but the Law of Circumcision given to Abraham by which the first confinement of the *Peculium* was made to a particular Nation. That *Clemens* does not misunderstand nor misapply this place of *Hermas*, though that author himself has no express mention of Gentiles. It is withal observable, that *Hermas* owns these first Patriarchs to have the Spirit, and that to the time of their Death, as neither having deserted by his conduct, nor having been deserted by him. And even these he makes dead in reference to the Spirit conferred on them by the Apostles in the state of Separation. The Apostles who received our Saviour's Baptism on Earth are therefore said in this Baptism of the separate Souls, to descend into the Water.

ve, and to rise out of the same Water
 ve also. Not so these just *Patriarchs*,
 who had this *Spirit*, and who had been so
 actually *obedient* to it, as never to have
 en *deserted* by it. Yet even they wanted
 the *quickning Spirit* of our *Saviour*, till it
 as conferred upon them by that *Baptism*
 our *Saviour*, which was administred to
 em by his *Apostles*. They could not have
 en said to have been *dead* when they de-
 ended into the *Baptismal Water*, if in their
 cent, they had already received that
 me *quickning Spirit*, which made them
 ve when they *ascended* out of that same
 ater. The *Spirit* therefore received by
 m before was only *External*, not an in-
 rd animating Principle of a new and im-
 rial Life, which might entitle them to
 aven, the Seat of *Immortality*. This is no
 ore than what the *Apostle* teaches us when
 tells us, that they *received not the Pro-*
se; God having provided some better thing
 us, that they without us should not be made
 fect, *Heb. xi. 39, 40*. What is this Pro-
 se? No other than the *πνεῦμα καὶ ζω-*
α, as *Philo* expresses it: The *Heavenly*
maam, and the *New Jerusalem* from above,
 the proper residence of the Man from Hea-
 n: *The City which hath foundations, whose*
ilder and maker is God, v. 10. The better
 untry, that is, the *Heavenly*, prepared
 them by God, *v. 16*. In regard of which
 he

he only sojourned in the land of promise, in a strange Countrey, dwelling in Tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him the same Promise, v. 9. Their dwelling in Tabernacles, is insisted on as an Argument of their *not* possessing that Land as *Inhabitants* but as *Sojourners*. And this again is urged to prove, That they dyed in Faith, *not* having received the Promises, but having seen them afar off. As their dwelling in Tabernacles is urged to prove, That they confessed that they were *Strangers* and *Pilgrims* in the Earth, v. 13. Heaven therefore is the Promise here intended, which therefore they had not yet attained, who had not yet received the Promise. And the Spirit also is a Promise, as it is a necessary qualification for Heaven it self. The Promise of the Father, S. Luke xxiv. 49. Act. i. 4. ii. 33. And therefore, as a Promise of the Father, promised not only by the Son, but by the Spirit also, in the Mystical Interpretations of the Old Testament, without which the other Mystical Promise of Heaven could not be performed to them. The exceeding great and precious Promise, by which we are partakers of the Divine Nature. 2. S. Pet. i. 4. That very Spirit which is the Prerogative of our Saviour's Baptism. So the Apostle says very expressly: *In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Spirit of Promise, which is the earnest of our Inheritance.*

ance, Eph. i. 13, 14. The *Earnest* must necessarily go before the *Inheritance*. Yet that very *Earnest* could not be receiv'd by these *Patriarchs* till they had heard and believed the *Gospel*, and had also received the Seal of *Baptism*. All which our *Apostolical* author *Hermas* makes performed to their souls in the state of *Separation*. Yet *Hermas* owns that the same *Patriarchs* had deceased in *Righteousness* and in great *Purity*: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἐκοιμήθησαν, καὶ ἐν μεγάλῃ ἀγνείᾳ. These are very proper dispositions for receiving the *Divine Spirit*. Yet they are not all, he owned formerly that they had the *Spirit*, and had ne'er deserted him, nor been deserted by him. How then comes it to pass that he makes them dead at their ascent into the *Baptismal Water*? That he makes them quickened by the *Apostles* who baptized them? So himself owns in the following words: Διὰ τούτων ἐν ἑξωποσίθησαν ἐπέγνωσαν τὸ ὄνομα τῆ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. So he opposes, when he makes them ascend alive out of the same *Baptismal Water* into which they had descended dead. He gives the Answer himself: That, notwithstanding these advantages, they still wanted the Seal of *Baptism*: Μόνον δὲ τῇ σφραγίδι ταύτην ἐκείνοι. We see here clearly, That having the *Spirit* as a *Guide* and an *external Assistant*, is not alone sufficient to entitle to that *Life* that is *Immortal* by these *Principles*. Our

having it *so* can only put us into that *condition* wherein *Adam* was before his fall, which was only a *mean* between *Mortality* and *Immortality*, indifferent to either. But the *immortalizing Principle* is the *Spirit*, as initiating us into a *new Life*, as a new *animating vital Principle*. So it is a *Principle* of a *new Birth* and a *Regeneration*. And so it is not to be expected any other way, than by our *Saviour's Baptism*, by the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*.

45. Our Saviour's Preaching was only to the Souls of the Jews, the Apostles, was also to those of the Gentiles, according to the Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus.

But our *Saviour's Preaching*, lasting only while his *Soul* together with his *Spirit* was in that *superiour Adns* (which was the *Receptacle* of the *better Souls* who were *qualified* for his *Favour*, according to the *Opinion* of *Clemens Alexandrinus*) could therefore be presumed *beneficial only* to the *Jews* who were then the *only Peculium*. Our *Saviour's first Commission* to his *Apostles* was *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and in any City of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel* S. *Matth.* x. 6. He plainly here confines their *Preaching* to the *Jews*, so as to forbid it to either of their *Rivals*: either the *Gentiles*, or even the *Samaritans*. Not only so, He owns the *confinement* of his *Commission* to them alone. So he answered the *Canaanitish Woman*; *I am not sent, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel*. xv. 24. So it was for the *time* of our *Saviour*. And

though

though he himself gave *intimations* that the *Gentiles* should afterwards be admitted immediately to the *same* Privileges; yet they were (for preventing the *Præjudices* he knew them *then* possessed with against it) in such *various Expressions*, that even the *Apostles* themselves were not, without *difficulty* induced, even then, either to *receive*, or *preach* to the *Gentiles*. This therefore gives a clear account of the Doctrine of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, why he ascribes the *preaching* to the *Jews* in *Advs* to our *Saviour*; but not to the *Gentiles*, to the *Apostles*, and other principal *Doctors* under the *new Dispensation*. His words are: Δέδεικται ὅτι ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ Στρωματί [p. 163.] τὸς ἁγίους, ἀκολούθως τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ τὸς ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκκλησιασμοῖς. Ἐχρῶ γὰρ, οἶμαι, καὶ ὡς περ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔτῳς ὅτι κακῶς τὸς ἀρεῖς τῶν μαθητῶν ἐκκλησίας γενέσθαι τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἢ ὁ μὲν, τὸς Ἑβραίων οἱ ὅτι, τὰ ἔθνη εἰς ὁμοιοφύνην ἀγαγόντες τέλει, τὸς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, τῇ κατὰ νόμον καὶ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, βεβιωκότας μὲν, ἐκείνους ὅτι, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτηκῶς, διαπερραμένους τὸν βίον. Τῷ γὰρ ἐπρεπε τῇ θεῷ οἰκονομίᾳ, καὶ ἀξίαν μᾶλλον ἐκκηρύσσειν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ ἐκκοινοῦν βεβιωκότας, ὅτι τε τοῖς πλεονεχέσι μελανενοικίας, καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ ἡρώσιν ἐξομολογούμενους ἐν τοῖς τῷ θεῷ ὄντας παντοκράτορος, κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκείνην σωθῆναι, Str. vi. p. 271. The Doctrines

Profelyting and receiving Gentiles into the

new *Peculium* were first reveal'd clearly after our Saviour's *Ascension*, in the time of the preaching of the *Apostles*. And accordingly the *Extraordinary Apostles*, S. Paul and S. Barnabas, began the Practice of Preaching to the *Gentiles*, in *Act. xiii.* The other *Apostles* learned this Doctrine from them, as they had done the other of admitting *Gentile Profelytes* from S. Peter, and his success also in the case of *Cornelius*. But they did not put it in Practice till 12 Years after our Saviour's *Ascension*, if we may believe the antient Tradition of *Apollonius* in *Eusebius*, and the very antient *Apocryphal* Book concerning the Preaching of S. Peter observed by *Clement* himself. Thenceforward therefore they were prepared for performing the same Office of Preaching to the deceased *Gentiles*, as themselves deceased, which they had performed before to their living *Posterity*, whilst themselves were living. This was very agreeable to the Notions of those Times, that separate Souls retained the habitual impressions contracted here, and were therefore delighted in doing the same things in the state of Separation, which had been acceptable to them in this World. And it was very proper that this Office should be performed by our Blessed Saviour himself and his *Apostles*, because they are the True *Catholick Church*, from whom all particular Churches derive their Title to Catholickity.

ism, by their *Communion* with *them* who
 ve the *Archetypal Communion* with the
 ther and the Son, as I have shewn in my
arænesis. For *separate Souls* are *uncapable*
 the *mediate Communion*, which is sufficient
 make our *Visible Churches* *Catholick*, by
Visible Symbols, administred by *Visible Au-*
thorized Representatives of the *Heads* of the
mystical Communion, the *Father* and the
son. And therefore can be *united* to them
 otherwise than by an *immediate Union*,
 they be admitted to any *Union* at all. He
 ds withal, that it is the employment of
 r Lord, as a *Saviour*, to save his own
workmanship, where-ever they are, that is,
 whether in the *Body* or *out* of it, by draw-
 ing them *εἰς ὁμήλειαν*. And indeed the
ἁμέλια from *Matter*, and *fleshly Lusts* as the
ails to *Matter*, hindring the *Ascent* of *Souls*
Heaven, is owned by the *Philosophers*,
 d ascribed by *them* to the *Λόγος* & as well
 by the *Scriptures*. They also were sen-
 sible of their duty of *following God*, and
possing themselves for it by *Purity* of *Flesh*
 d *Spirit*. They expected a *Union* with
 d by these *Purgations*. So *Porphyry* in
Life of *Plotinus*, pretends himself twice
 have enjoyed this *Union*, and *S. Justin*
martyr expected it, *before* his *Conversion*
 the *Christian Religion*, by his *Philosophi-*
Purgations, as himself informs us in his
dialogue with *Tryphon*. And they who

practised them were stiled θεοί, and were thought to have *Divine* and *Theurgical* Virtues as well as others, as being thereby made themselves *Divine*, which must therefore entitle them to *Heaven* upon their *Dissolution* from their *Bodies*. He further adds That the *Punishments* inflicted by God on the *Gentiles* in their *separate State*, were σωτήριοι, and παιδεύτικαί, and εἰς ἐμπροσθεν ἀγασαί. The word ἐμπροσθεν is thus used by the *Philosophers*, as well as the *Sacred Writers*, for a *Conversion* of their Thoughts from *Worldly* to *Heavenly* Objects, To which he subjoyns a farther advantage of the *separate State* for this purpose, that *Souls* in that condition can see more clearly though darkened by remaining *habitual Passions*, on this very account, that they are not *diverted* by attending to the *fleeting Principle*: διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπὶ ἐμπροσθεν εἶδαι οὐκ ἔστι. He mentions also the Argument from God's being *no Acceptor of Persons*, which is the same that is observed by S. Peter in the Case of *Cornelius*, *Act. x. 34*. And allowed by St. Paul, *Rom, ii. 11*, And with this very application to the Case of *Jews* and *Gentiles*. That in relation to *Souls* and the concerns of the *future State*, *Gentiles* are as *acceptable* to him as *Jews*. That in every Nation, he that feareth him and worketh *Righteousness* is accepted of him, *Act. x. 35*. as S. Peter himself interpreted

interprets that Phrase. The Privileges therefore of the *Jews*, as a *Peculium*, ought not so to be understood as to be inconsistent with this, because *God* never was an *Accepter of Persons*. And the *Primitive* Writers, and the *Apostle* in *Heb. xi.* prove it from so many of the *Patriarchs* as were *εὐάρεστοι* to him, before he was pleased to fix upon a *Peculium*, and have the name of *Righteous* ascribed to them in the *Scriptures* themselves, as *Noah*, *Lot*, *Job*, and others. Accordingly he distinguishes between two *Righteousnesses*, κατὰ νόμον and κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, and makes *Philosophy* to have the same power for qualifying the *Gentiles* for the Favour of the *Gospel*, that the *Law* had for the *Jews*. Or, if *Righteousness* must necessarily have a relation to *Law*; yet even so, *living well* is the same thing as *living Legally*; and a *living* according to the *Rule of right Reason*, the same with *living* according to *Law*. So he: καὶ τὸ καλῶς βίβειν, καὶ νομίμως ἔστι βίβειν καὶ τὸ εὐλογως βίβειν, κατὰ νόμον ἔστι βίβειν. Ὅρθως βεβαιώχοντες οἱ περὶ νόμου εἰς πᾶν ἐργάζονται, καὶ δικαιοὶ εἶναι ἐκείνησαν. This *Life* was imputed to them for *Faith*, so far as they were capable of *Faith* without a *Preacher*, by the *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, in *Heb. xi.* And that *Faith* was imputable to them for *Righteousness*. I see nothing in this *Hypothesis* of *S. Clement*, but what is allowable by the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*.

46.

No Patri-
archal Co-
venant can
oblige Po-
sterity to
consent to
the Hazard
of Eternal
Misery.

But the *Foundation* of this whole Dis-
course, seems to be grounded on the ori-
ginal Equality of all *Humane Souls*, of those
who were *without*, as well as of those who
were *within*, the *Old Peculium*. Both sorts
bore *originally* the εἰκὼν of *Adam*, and
could pretend to nothing *higher*, than
what they could derive from *him*. Nor
could the *Jews* pretend to any *Dignity* of
their *Souls* above the *Gentiles*, as descended
from their proper *National Patriarchs*. No
εἰκὼν from any of them, distinct from that
which was common to the *Gentiles*, as
well as *them*, from *Adam*. This made it
look like *accepting of Persons*, if God had
dealt so *unequally*, in distributing the
greatest of his *Favours* to *Persons* who had
otherwise so *equal* Pretensions to them.
That *they* were also the *Divine Off-spring*,
is owned by *S. Paul*, when he quotes the
Passage of *Aratus* the *Poet* to that Purpose
with *Approbation*. This made them all
like entitled to the Care of *Divine Provi-
dence*. Accordingly, when the *Apostle* speaks
of the πνεῦμα, the Principle of *Immortal-
ity*, as the εἰκὼν of the λόγος, and there-
fore deriveable only from *him*; he opposes
it only to the ψυχή, which he calls the
εἰκὼν of *Adam*. What can be more obvious
from hence, than that he did not here
consider *Man* as descended from any *subor-
dinate Patriarch*, but as the Seed of *Adam*.

whom the *Gentiles* had as fair a Claim
 the *Jews* themselves ? The *Old Peculium*
 therefore could not, in Affairs relating
 to *Souls immediately*, challenge any *Privi-*
lege, on account of their proper *Patriarchs*,
 and the particular *Covenants* made by God
 with them. Not one of those *Covenants*
 ever mention any thing relating to the
 separate Condition of single *Souls*. All of
 them concern *Posterity* as *Bodies*, and are
 sufficiently satisfied in the good or ill *Suc-*
cesses of the *Bodies*, how anomalous soever
 the Case might be of single *Members* of
 those *Bodies*. They might be happy in the
Calamities of their *Nation*; and on the con-
 trary, very *unhappy* under the *prosperous*
successes of the *Publick*, notwithstanding
 their own strict *Observance* of their *Duty*;
 y, for that very Reason, because they
 do observe it. Many *Heroical Virtues*, are
 occasions of *Personal Calamities*. Withal
 the *Interests* of private *Persons*, are incon-
 sistent with those of the *Publick*. And in
 these Cases, the better the *Men* are, the
 more they must think themselves obliged to
 submit to what may make their *Persons* mi-
 serable, when their *Private Happiness* is
 inconsistent with that of the *Publick*, or
 where their *private Calamities* may promote
 the *Prosperity* of their *Nation*, and their
 country. But then this can only hold in
 such Cases, wherein, all things consider'd,
 the

the *Publick Good* may *Countervail* their own *private Inconveniences*, and wherein the *themselves* may have *Reason to believe* it sufficient *Compensation* for what they suffer by it. And so they may, while the *Evil* is *finite*, and can reach no farther than the *Bodies*, though it be *Death* it self, and that with *Torment* too. And it has been often thought so by *wise and Considerate Persons*. The continued *Protection* of their *whol* *Lives*, and the *Honour* thereby purchased to their *Memory*, and the *Favour* to the *Posterity* and *Friends*, and *Well-wishers*, and even the *Good* of the *Publick* itself, may be judged a sufficient *Compensation* in the *Opinion* of grateful *Persons*, who value the *Publick* beyond all *Posterity*, or *private Benefactions*. But *Eternal Misery*, of what Degree soever, can admit of no possible *Compensation*, even in the *Judgment* of reasonable *Gratitude*. And what is *unreasonable* cannot, for that *Reason*, be thought *virtuous* or *commendable*. Here therefore every *private Person* must judge ultimately by his *private Interests*. For no *Publick Law* can oblige any further than its *Rewards* and *Punishments*: That is, than its *Rewards* may be great enough to make *Amends* for all the *Evils* that may be incurred by complying with it; and its *Punishments* greater than can be recompensed by all the *Advantages* that may be gained by *Disobedience*. B

Etern

Eternal Misery cannot be *countervail'd* by any *Legal Rewards* of *Obedience*. No *Patriarchal Covenant* therefore can oblige *Posterity* to submit to *Eternal Misery*, on Consideration of any *Publick Interest* whatsoever of the *Patriarchal Family*. Nor can it therefore undertake for their *Posterity*, in such a case where any *single Soul* may be exposed for the *Good* of the *Community*. The *Covenants* thereof, of *this kind*, must be transacted with each *single Individual*, so as to put it in his *own Power*, whether he will, or will not, be *eternally miserable*. What may be done by *God's absolute Power*, I am not now concerned to enquire. It is sufficient for my Purpose at present, that even *God's* proceeding at *that rate*, is not agreeable to those *Rules of Justice and Equity* received among *Men*, which even he himself owns and appeals to in the *Scriptures*, as the *Measures* of his *Proceedings* with his *reasonable Creatures*. No *Man* can reasonably submit his *Eternal Interests* to the *Hazards* of another's fallible *Judgment* and flexible *Free-will*, on any Consideration whatsoever of other *Advantages*. Nor can *God's* Goodness permit him to *necessitate* a *reasonable Creature* to act *contrary* to the *Nature* with which he has endued it; that is, to submit to the *Determination* of another, in such a case where no *rightly inform'd Understanding* can judge a *Submission* *reasonable*.

ble. This is therefore a Case wherein every *single* Rational Being, has a *Right* to determine for it self, and *not* to be concluded by the *Act* of any *Patriarchal* Ancestors.

47.
God appropriating the Old Peculium did not exclude the Gentiles then living from the Benefits of the New Peculium relating to their Souls.

But in other Cases whereby *Rights* are gained by *Posterity*, sufficient to make *Amends* for any consequential *Inconveniences*; it is but *reasonable*, that where *Posterity* gain *Rights* by the *Acts* of their *Predecessors*, they should be *obliged* to bear with such *consequential Inconveniences*. But this can reach no farther than what they have *received* from their *Fore-fathers*, which is their *Bodies*, which being, as *derived* from them, confessedly *Mortal*, can expose them to no *Sufferings*, that can be *Eternal*. As for their *Souls*, if they be derived also from their *Ancestors*, that very Consideration alone would be sufficient to prove them *Mortal*, by the *Reasonings* of those *Ages* we are speaking of, of the greatest *Authority*. But if they be indeed *Immortal*; so far, as they are so, they could not be derived from their *Parents*, nor could they consequently be liable to all *Obligations* contracted by their *Ancestors*. However by their *Bodies*, the *Posterity* of the *Old Peculium* had great *advantages* above the *rest* of *Mankind*, even with Relation to *God*, and *Conveniences* for their *Souls*. Their *Nation* was taken *immediately* into the *Divine Protection* of the *Supreme Being*; not *mediately*, like

other

other Nations. This secured them of a
 more powerful Patron, whenever their *Inter-
 ests* should be *inconsistent* with the *Interests*
 of any other rival Nations. Then their
 Government was *Theocratical*, so long as
 themselves endured it should be so; that
 God himself *nominated* the *Persons* that should
 be their *Supreme Governours*, who could not
 fail of *choosing* fit *Persons* for that Purpose,
 as *themselves* did, when he was prevailed
 on afterwards, by their Importunity, to
 permit the Government to the Hazards of an
Hereditary Succession. Yet even then they
 had the Assistance of *Divine Oracles*, for
 the *Direction* of the *Governours*, for the
time being, so long, as they were willing to be
 guided by them, even for their *Secular Af-
 fairs*. That of *Urim* in the *High-Priest*,
 and of their *Prophets*, empower'd with suf-
 ficient *Credentials* to prove their *Divine*
Mission, and these surer than those which
 were given to other Nations, by inferiour
subordinate Demons. Withal, that the
Messiah, the *Incarnate Logos*, the great
Restorer of Souls, was to derive his *Flesh*
 from them. This was a great Endearment
 of them to him, and gave them a great
 security for *expecting Favours* from him,
 according to the received Notions of those
 Times, concerning the *Duties* good Men
 were obliged to pay to their Nations and
 countries. Yet our Saviour very frequent-
 ly

ly gives them warning not to reckon on this *Carnal Relation*, and signifies that good *Dispositions of Mind* were much more valuable to him, where-ever he found them in reference to the End of his own Coming. He seems to check his own *Mother*, when she concerned her self in the Exercise of a Power greater than any he had *derived from her*. He prefers the Case of *hearing* the word and *keeping* it, before that of the *Woman* that *bore him*, and the *Paps* that had given *him suck*. Such he owns for his *Mother*, his *Sisters* and his *Brethren*, rather than those who had those Relations to his *Flesh*. He values *Nathanael* more on account of his being a *true Israelite*, and ἀδελφός with out any Indications of νοθεΐα and degeneracy from his famous *Ancestors*, than on account of his *Extraction* from them. This is the *true Israelitism*, which is so often afterwards *opposed* to *Israelitism* according to the *Flesh*, the *Seed of Abraham's Faith*, which he had *while he was yet uncircumcised*. So he declares his Approbation of the *Faith* of the *Syrophœnician Canaanitish Woman*, after he had seemed to upbraid her with her *Descent*, and try'd her *Constancy* in *bearing the Reproach*. And in the Case of the *Centurion*, he wonders and declares, that he had not found *great Faith*, *no not in Israel*. Plainly intimating *that* to be *more esteemed* by him than being *descended from Israel*. Then

e takes occasion to foretel the Reception
 of the *Gentiles* into the *Peculium*; that many
 would come from the East and West, and
 would sit down with Abraham and Isaac and
 Jacob [the so much boasted *Patriarchs* of
 the Jews] in the Kingdom of Heaven, when
 the Children of the Kingdom should be cast out
 to outer Darknes. Which plainly shews,
 that our Blessed Lord never had the *least*
 regard to eminent Examples of Virtue a-
 mong the *Gentiles*, on that account, that
 they were not of the *chosen Seed*. On the
 contrary, he rather seems to censure that
Exclusion of their common Offices of
 Humanity to their own beloved Nation,
 when he recommends the Behaviour of the
 good Samaritan to the wounded Man, be-
 cause that of the Priest and Levite, who
 was passed by unconcerned, because he was no
 ally, when the Samaritan had pity on him,
 though not more nearly ally'd to him, than
 they were, on a National Account. Ra-
 ther he prefers that Virtue which he finds
 where he had least Reason to expect it,
 where himself had bestowed the least Cultiva-
 tion. There is therefore no reason to
 suspect that our Blessed Saviour should con-
 sider his Design, as a Saviour of Souls, only
 of the Souls of the Old *Peculium*. In truth,
 the whole Ground of the choosing that *Pecu-*
 lium it self, was, that he might thereby re-
 ward the Moral Virtues of their Ancestors.
 God

God himself owns the *Faith* of Abraham the *Father* of the *Faithful*, in being willing to part with his only *Son*, when God was pleased to require him, as the *Reason* of choosing his *Posterity* for his *Peculium*. *Because thou hast done this thing, and hast withheld thy Son, thine only Son: In blessing, I will bless thee; and in multiplying, will multiply thy Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea-shore, and thy Seed shall possess the Gate of his Enemies: And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my Voice; Gen. xxii. 16, 17, 18.* The last Words are applied to *Christ* himself by the *Apostle*, *Gal. iii. 16*. By which we understand that the Interest the *Jews* had, even in the *Flesh* of *Christ*, and all the *Honours* and *Favours* resulting from thence, were the *Rewards* of that *Personal Act* of *Abraham*. But this was indeed after his *Circumcision*. However there are the like *Promises* made to him, upon his *first Act* of *Faith* in leaving his *Country* at *God's Command* (that very *Particular* not excepted which relates to *Christ*) that in him all the *Families of the Earth* should be blessed, *Gen. xii. 1, 2, 3*. This was before his *Circumcision*, on account of that *Faith* which he had, being yet *uncircumcised*, *Rom. x. 9*, on which account all who are the *Children* of his *Faith* are as much entitled to the

Prom

promises made to him and his Seed, by the
 reasonings of the *New Testament*, and of the
first Fathers, as the *Jews* themselves. And
 though *Circumcision* had been necessary to
 entitle to that *Covenant*, of which *Circum-*
cision was a *Seal* : yet it was not the *Cir-*
cumcision of the *Flesh*, but of the *Spirit*,
 that was the *true Mystical Circumcision*,
 which was the *Circumcision* that was ac-
 ceptable to *God*, by the same *Reasonings* of
 the *New Testament*. And of this *Circum-*
cision, *Gentiles* were as capable as the *Jews*
 themselves. And these *Reasonings*, in both
 cases, are grounded on *Testimonies* of the
Old Testament, proving these *Interpretations*
 agreeable to the *Mind* of the *Legislator*,
 even then, as the *Reasonings* of the *New*
Testament generally prove those things
 which the *Jews* took for *Innovations* in the
Revelations of the *Gospel*, to be so far from
 being really *Innovations*, as that they were
 always more *designed* by *God*, and more
 patiently so, than the *literal Interpretation*
 of the *Law*, which seemed so *inconsistent*
 with them. These *Rules of Reasoning* will
 reach the *Gentiles* who lived then, as to
 the *Equity* of them, as well as those who
 lived after the *Promulgation* of the *Gospel*.
 And, in truth, I cannot imagine what
Abraham could have for recommending
 the first acts of *Faith*, which entitiled him
 to the following *confining Covenant* with
 him

him and his *Children*, that could not be pleadable with as much *Equity* for any *Gentile Patriarch* then living, who had been as good as *Abraham*, as it was for *Abraham* himself. And, though there was no *Patriarch* then living, who gave the same *Evidence* of his absolute *Resignation* to God by any outward *Act*, as *Abraham* did, that could not, in *Equity*, be any *Exception* against the *Acceptableness* of the like *Heroical Acts* of any of the *Posterity* of such *Patriarchs*, who had no *Promise* or *Covenant* for *Acceptance* derived from their *Ancestors*. However such *pious Successors* were in the same *Condition*, as to their *single Persons* as *Abraham* was, before the *Covenant* that appropriated the *Old Peculium*. And therefore had the same *Plea* for *Acceptance*, as he had, in *Equity*: especially with him who, in this very *Case*, professes himself to be no *Acceptor of Persons*. And, however they might fail of a *Title* by their *carneal Ancestors*; yet they had one by *Abraham* himself (as many of them, at least, as lived after him) by these *Christian Reasonings*. They were also the *Sons* of his *Faith*, though not of his *Flesh*. They had the true *Seal* of the *Circumcision*, not of the *Flesh*, but of the *Spirit*, which even the *Prophets* themselves of the *Old Testament* look on as the *truly beneficial Circumcision*. And, by this means, they must also be qualified for

lified to be *Members* of that *Mystical Body*,
 of which our *Saviour* is the *Mystical Head*,
 which will, in *Consequence*, entitle them to
 the *Spirit*, that they who are *one Body* in
 him, may be *one Spirit* in him also. I know
 not how this *Reasoning* can be avoided, in
 Relation to the *Mystical Benefits* of even
 that *Peculium*, of which kind all *they* are
 that relate to the *future State*. And such
 alone are they for which the Writers of the
New Testament are concerned. They did
 not rival the *Jews* in their Title to the
Earthly, but the *Heavenly Canaan*; not to
 the *Earthly*, but the *Heavenly Jerusalem*.
 This *Reasoning* therefore did not hinder but
 that *Carnal Extraction* from *Abraham*, or an
Incorporation into his *Patriarchal Body* by a
Carnal Circumcision, were the only *Le-*
gal Means that could convey a *Right* to the
Earthly Canaan, and the *Earthly Jerusalem*:
 Nor did they hinder, but that even that
Relation to our *Saviour's Flesh*, and *their*
 being the *natural Olive* into which *others*
 were to be *inoculated*, at least *mystically*, in
 order to a *Participation* of their *mystical*
Sap and *Fatness*, were great *Prerogatives*
 of the *Jewish Nation*. Nor does the Apo-
 stle ever allow them *more*, even when he is
 most liberal in his *Concessions* to *them*.
 He never owns any *Advantage* of theirs a-
 bove the *Gentiles*, as to *purely Spirituals*,
 and, in regard to the State of their *separate*

Souls, supposing equal Dispositions in both Cases. Nor does he suppose this spiritual Equality preached by the Gospel, to have begun with the Promulgation of the Gospel but to have been as old as the Gospel it self before Ages and Generations, and before the Foundation of the World. Plainly implying it, as to God's Design of it, to have been elder than the Law of Moses, or the elder Foot-steps of that which was commonly taken for the elder Peculium. This is sufficient for my Purpose to shew the Probability that God never intended to exclude the Gentiles from the Benefits their Souls might receive by our Saviour's Incarnation. Not even those, who were not then incorporated into the Jewish Nation, by a Carnal Circumcision. Which being supposed, the Assertion of S. Clement cannot be thought strange that Philosophy might perform the same Office for the Gentiles, which the Law of Moses did for the Jews, in preparing them for the Spirit, which neither of them could receive as an immortalizing Principle, but by the Gospel. What is this Philosophy but the Moral Duties of the Mosaic Law, being owned as reasonable and obliging by the Philosophers, who were the Guides of those Gentiles who knew nothing of the Law of Moses. And what is this but the Law written in their Hearts, which the Apostle owns sufficient to make it Law to those who find

so? This doing the *things* prescribed in the Law, under the Sense of an inward Conviction, that they were obliged to do so, seems to be what God *himself* calls *having his Law written in their Hearts*, and wishes earnestly that it were his *Peoples* case. Why then should we wonder if it should prove *acceptable* to him in the *Gospel* also?

The Scripture therefore *supposes* all other humane Souls equal with *those* of the old *Testament*; and that it would be *acceptance* of Persons with God to treat equal Souls with *unequal Favours*, when considered *single*, without relation to the *Bodies* to which they belong. It owns no *inequality* in *mankind* in general, but what is made by *Accession* of the Spirit, as an *animal Principle* of new Life, which is not given but by our Saviour's Baptism, and therefore proper to our *new Pecuniary*. But you desire to know how this *accessional Spirit* is distinguished from the Soul, and from the *Divine Spirit*, which is the *third Person* in the *Trinity*? I shall therefore endeavour to explain it according to the Sense of the Scripture. And indeed as the word *Spirit* signifies *breathing*, by which we live, every Principle of life is called *Spirit*. So there is the Spirit of the *Beast*, that goeth downward to the earth, opposed to the Spirit of *Man* that

48.

The highest part of the Rational Soul (as distinguished from the Divine Spirit) is called a Spirit, yet naturally mortal.

goeth upward, Eccl. iii. 21. So again, the *Spirit of Man*, as differing from the *Beast*, is opposed to the *Divine Spirit*. What *Man* knoweth the things of a *Man*, save the *Spirit of a Man* which is in him; even so the thing of *God* knoweth no *Man*, but the *Spirit of God*, 1 Cor. ii. 11. And, *The Spirit beareth Witness with our Spirit, that we are Children of God*, Rom. viii. 16. This may be thought strange, that this *supreme Degree* in *Man*, should be *contradistinguished* from the *Divine Spirit*. But before I can speak to that, I must first shew what the *Principle* in *Man* is, that is called *Spirit*, and yet opposed to the *Divine Spirit*. This plainly appears in the place now mentioned, where it is opposed to the *Spirit of a Beast*. It must therefore be that *Power* which is *proper* to *Man*, and which distinguishes him from the *Beasts* which have no pretence to it: That is, *Understanding*. Therefore the *Beasts* are said to have no *Understanding*, Ps. xxxii. 9. And the *Man* that has no *Understanding*, is said to be like *Beasts that perish*, Ps. xlix. 13. 20. The *Principle* therefore which makes him like *Beasts*, must make him *perishable* as *Beasts* are, and therefore cannot secure him from *actual Mortality*. That is signified by the *Spirit of the Beasts* going downward to *Earth*. As all the space below the *Heaven* is called *Earth*, and is supposed to be

Region of Death, the *צלמה* Valley and Shadow of Death, and the *Darkness* of this World, as the *World* contains the *Air* also. This therefore is the Condition of that Man which was formed out of the *Dust* of the Ground, Gen. ii. 7. the *χῆς* in the Greek. This obliged him to *return* into the *Dust* again, Gen. iii. 19. Eccl. xvii. 1. *Wisd.* vii. 1. which is the *reason* why the *Gnosticks* made this *Choical Man* so *Mortal*, as not to *survive* the *Dissolution* of the *Body*, and therefore to have no place in the *future State*, not so much as in that which they call the *State of Mediety*, below the *Pleroma*, the place of the *Eternal Aëons*. This part of the *Soul* included the *concupiscible* and *irascible Powers*, all that were not *Rational*. This the *Hereticks* ascribed to lower Powers than the *Supreme Being*; and for that Reason made them *Mortal*. Either the *Angels* or the *Demiurgus*, whom they reckon'd for a *lower Being*, below the *Pleroma*, were supposed to be the *Authors* of them. And that, with this very *Design*, that *Man* might consist of a *Mixture*, some things *Mortal*, and some *Immortal*. The *Doctrine* of the *Platonists*, whom they followed, was, that whatever was produced by the *Supreme Being*, could be no other but *Immortal*. Therefore, that the *World* might have of both

sorts, other *Inferior* Beings were to be produced (*Mortal* of their own *Nature*, and *Immortal* only by the *Pleasure* of *God*) which were to *produce* those things which were *designed* for *Mortal*. Which *Reasoning* they applied to *Man* the *Microcosm*, as a Being constituted of *Mortals* and *Immortals* also. Nor did the *Hereticks* alone follow herein the *Opinion* of the *Platonists*. *Philo* also is too favourable to it ; but that *Reasoning* is certainly false : For if *God* could not produce *Mortals*, they could never have been produced at all ; because the *first* of them could never have *received* its *Being*, but from something that was *Self-originated* and *Immortal*. I only mention their *Opinion*, to shew that *they* also were agreed in the *Mortality* of this *lower Soul*. But whether they had been so agreed or not, I am not much concerned. It is sufficient for my Purpose, that the *Scripture* does not countenance it, which, notwithstanding, is sufficiently *clear*, in asserting the *Mortality* of this *lowest Degree* of the *Soul*.

49. And this indeed I take to be that which the *Scripture* calls $\psi\chi\lambda\omega$ simply. For when it has the *Accession* of that *Divine Afflatus*, which is called the *Spirit* of a *Man*, it is then called $\psi\chi\lambda\iota \zeta\omega\sigma\alpha$. So the Words of *original*, and as qualifying us for a Union with that truly *Divine Spirit*, by which we are actually immortalized.

Phil. de.
Mund, op.
& Allegor.
l. 1.

the Greek interpreter imply, which is the Text of the New Testament Writers: Καὶ πλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ ἄνθρωπον, χεὶν ἀπὸ τῆ γῆς καὶ ἐμφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. Gen. ii. Here is an ἄνθρωπος supposed *before* the Divine breathing. Certainly not a dead Man, which is indeed *no Man*, but a *Man* animated with that lower Soul, which is common to *him* and *Beasts*, and therefore cannot be imputed to a *Divine Breathing*. Which was the *Honour*, the Psalmist speaks of, that distinguished him from the *Beasts* that *perish*. However that *lower Soul* supposes him endued with all those Powers which belong to that *lower Life*, which we call *Animal*, in Opposition to that which is properly *Rational*. It must therefore be a *higher Life* that made that, which before was only *ψυχή* to be now a *ψυχὴ ζῶσα*. And such a *Life* as was worthy of its *Original*, the *πνοὴ ζωῆς* by which it was conveyed; which therefore must be *Divine*, that it might answer its *Divine Original*. In truth, the same *Life* which is given by the *Divine Spirit* it self, only in that *lower* Degree, which is imply'd in the *Phrases* used concerning them, of *ψυχὴ ζῶσα* and *πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖν*. The one only implies a derivative, precarious, dependent, participation of the same *Life*, which is supposed to be so *originally* in the *πνεῦμα*, as that it can

com-

communicate to others the same Life, of which it self is the original Principle. This πνοή is that which the Fathers, from Is. xlii. 5. suppose to be common to all Mankind. And indeed this Spirit of Man, properly so called, as distinguished from the Spirit of God, is notwithstanding so mentioned in the Scriptures, as a peculiar Honour where in Man is superiour to all other visible Animals. So it is in the Psalms now mentioned. So in the viiith Psalm, which is a professed Encomium of that Man immediately, yet secondarily of the Man from Heaven Ebr. ii. 7, 8. who is the same with the Lord from Heaven, and the quickening Spirit, 1 Cor. xv. 35, 37. who is called the Son, and the second Adam, and Christ in the same Chapter. And it is implied in the particular Concern God was pleased to take upon himself, for producing this living Soul above what he had shewed in producing the Soul it self. So φῶς καὶ πνοὴ ἀνθρώπου Prov. xx. 27. Thus we understand the Words of Tatian, who says that the Soul of Man is Darknes. His Meaning was comparatively; as when the Light that is in a candle is said to be Darknes, S. Matth. vi. 23. S. Luke xi. 35. So this very πνοὴ is Darknes in comparison with the πνεῦμα as the greater Light, though otherwise it also is φῶς and φῶς καὶ πνοὴ, which can hardly be understood of any but that mystical φῶς which

which is derived from the Λόγος, and whose proper *Seat* is in the Region of *Light*, which is opposed to the *Darkness* of this *World*. Thus the *Spirit* of *Man* is said to go upwards, in the forementioned place of *Ecclesiastes*: That is, when it returns to God that gave it, *Eccl.* xii. 7. So *Philo* also explains the difference between this πνοή and πνεῦμα. His Words are very remarkable for clearing the Notions of the *Hellenists*, concerning this Matter. And they are these: Πνοὴν δ', ἀλλ' ἢ πνεῦμα εἶρηκεν, ὡς διαφορὰς ἔσσης. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πνεῦμα νενοῦται κατὰ τὴν ἰχὺν καὶ εὐτονίαν καὶ δύναμιν ἢ δὲ πνοὴ ὡς ἂν αὐρά τις ὅτι καὶ ἀναθυμίασις ἡρεμγία καὶ περαεῖα. Ὁ μὲν ἐν κατὰ τὴν εἰσὶνα γεγενῶς καὶ τὴν ἰδέαν νῆς, πνεύματι δ' ἂν λέγοιτο κεκοινημέναι. Ῥωμῶν γὰρ ἔχει ὁ λογισμός αὐτῆς. Ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὕλης καὶ κέφης καὶ ελαφροτέρας ὡς ἂν ἀποφορὰς τινός, ὅπου γίνονται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρωμάτων. Φυλαττομένων γὰρ ἐδὲν ἥττον καὶ μὴ ἐκσυμμιωμένων, εὐωδία τις γίνεται. This πνοή is plainly distinguished from the ὁ κατὰ τὴν εἰσὶνα νῆς, as weaker, as *Flesh*, and *Spirit* are usually opposed in *Scripture*, when weakness is ascribed to the *Flesh*, and *Strength* to the *Spirit*. That is not all. This πνοή is owned to be *material*, like the *Steams* of odoriferous Bodies. That Consideration alone is sufficient to cut it off from any Pretensions to any proper *natural Immortality*. Yet he makes this to be the νῆς by which

which the *mystical* *ένωσις* is made with the *Divine Spirit*. So before: *Τεῖα γδ εἶ) δέ) τὸ ἐμπνέον, τὸ δεχόμενον, τὸ ἐμπνεόμενον. Το μὴ ἐν ἐμπνέον, ἔστιν ὁ θεός· τὸ δὲ δεχόμενον, ὁ νῆς· τὸ δὲ ὑπννεόμενον, τὸ πνεῦμα. Τί ἐκ τῶτων συνάγεται; Ένωσις γίνεσθαι τῷ τελεῶν, τείναντ. τῷ θεῷ τὸ ἀφ' ἐαυτῷ δύναμιν διὰ τὸ μέσθ πνεύματ. ἀχει τῷ ὑποκαρδύς.* The *νῆς* here mentioned, is afterwards called *ἀνθρώπιν. νῆς*, which he says, would not dare to aspire so high, *ὡς ἀντλαβέσθαι θεῷ φύσως*, if God himself had not drawn it to him, as a *Humane Mind* is capable of being drawn. The *τεῖα φύσις* is the *Holy Ghost* in *S. Peter*. And its drawing the same with that mentioned by our Saviour, when he tells us that none can come to him except his *Father* draw him, *S. John* vi. 44. And, that *himself* would draw all *Men* after him, xii. 32. And the *ἀντίληψις* the same with the *εὐαγγέλις* spoke of before. And the *ένωσις* the *Unity of the Spirit*. Yet this *νῆς ἀνθρώπιν.*, which could not *præsume* to aspire to this *Divine Commerce*, can be no other than a *Creature*. However, in Comparison of the lower unreasonable *Soul*, he owns it for a kind of *God*: *ὡσανεὶ γδ θεός ἔστι τὸ ἀλόγθ ὁ νῆς*, which he proves from *Moses's* being made a *God* to *Pharoah*. Thus therefore *S. Paul's* words are to be understood, when, from *Aratus*, he calls us *God's offspring*.

spring. And our Saviour's, when he applies the Words of the Psalmist, *I have said ye are Gods*, to these $\omega\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{o}\ \Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma\ \epsilon\gamma\acute{\gamma}\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$, S. John x. 34, 35. This lower Spirit therefore it is that *lusteth* against the *Flesh*, as the *Flesh* lusteth against the *Spirit*. And the *Spirit* that is formed by God in Man, Zech. xii. And the $\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\ \zeta\omega\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ in Wisd. xv. 11. where it is mentioned as *distinct* from the *active* Soul. Yet both of them are infused by *breathing*. Unless possibly there may be some critical Difference, more than I am yet aware of, between $\epsilon\mu\pi\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ and $\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$. Yet $\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is ascribed to the $\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ here, which Philo ascribes to the $\psi\chi\eta\ \zeta\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha$, and seems to make it signify the same thing with $\epsilon\mu\pi\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. So he: $\gamma\epsilon\mu\lambda\acute{\omega}\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu\ ,\ \acute{\iota}\sigma\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\varsigma}\tau\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \psi\acute{\omega}\chi\omega\sigma\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\alpha}\psi\chi\alpha.$

I know very well, our modern Divines since the *Aristotelian* Philosophy, as expounded by the *Arabians*, has been received as the *Standard* of the *Philosophical* (Phænomena of Divinity) do not allow these two parts of the *Human Soul* to be so *distinct*, as to be *separable*. They rather make them only *distinct* Powers of the same Principle. But you should be pleased to remember that, in this whole Discourse, I make no modern sentiments my *Rule*, any farther, than as they agree with the sense of the *Primitive* Church in the *purest* times. And I know

50.

The Primitive Christians suppose this distinction of the Two Souls in Man, as Fundamental, in their Disputes with their coeval Heretics.

not

not how it can be doubted but *that Church* allowed the *distinction*. This appeared in the Disputes then raised by the *Hereticks* concerning the *Human Nature* of our Blessed Lord. Especially the *Arians* and *Apollinarists*. The one of them thought the *Divinity* supplied the Office of even the *Human Soul*. The others granted him to have a *Soul* consubstantial to ours; but pretended however, that the *Divinity* supplied at least, the Office of the *Human λόγος*, or *Nēs*. Nor do the *Catholicks*, in their Disputes against them *both*, deny the *distinction*, but assert each of them to *him*, as *essential* to the true *Human Nature*, without each of which he could not have been *Homosubstantial* to us, as to his *Human Nature*, as he was to his *Father*, in regard of his *Divinity*, according to the determination of the Council of *Chalcedon*. Particularly, the most learned and judicious Bishop *Pearson* thinks that the Assertion of the *Soul* of our Lord against the *Apollinarists*, was the true reason why the Article of the *Descent into Hell*, was inserted into the *then* received *Creeds*. And indeed with great probability. Which shews that the Church *then* took for *more* than a *disputable* Opinion. Such they did not insert in *Creeds*, but only in *Doctrines* which *themselves*, at least, believed *Fundamental*. But *both* these parts of the *Soul* were supposed in this Article

the *descent* into *Hell*. For it could not be meant of his *Divinity*, (which being *omnipresent*) neither can *ascend* nor *descend*. And it was his *Soul* which the *Psalmist* foretold as not left in *Hell*. And *Adns* is the *Hell* there spoken of, which is the common receptacle of *Souls*, both good and bad, in the state of *separation*. But the *Choical* Soul, could not survive the *Body* without the *breath* of *Life*, which preserves it from *extinguishing*, when the *Body* is made incapable of being acted by it. Its *Union* with the *ῥῆς πνεῦμα* is that alone which can then continue its *Being*, so long as the *ῥῆς* or *πνεῦμα* continues in its own *Being*. This therefore alone makes it capable of coming into *Adns*, which is a state, not of *non-existence*, but of *Invisibilty* only. The *mosticks* therefore, in *S. Irenæus*, who believed these *Two Souls*, not only *separable*, but *actually separated*; accordingly thought there were *Choical Men* who had the lower soul without the *ῥῥὸν ζῶνς*, who had no portion in the *separate* State, as *perishing* together with the *Body*; and that the *Psyical Men*, who had the *Nῆς*, as well as the *ῥῥῆς*, could pretend no higher than the *status Medietatis*, being excluded from the *Seroma*, the Seat of those *Beings* which were properly *Immortal*. So *S. Athanasius*, against the *Apollinarists*, proves it necessary that

that our *Saviour* should assume the upper as well as the *lower* Soul, if he designed a compleat Salvation of our *whole Man*. Thus therefore it plainly appears, that in the *Opinions* of those *Times*, these *Two Souls* were distinguished from each other; and much more from the *Divine Spirit* received in *Baptism*, which was the Principle of proper *Immortality*. As much as the *Divinity* of our *Saviour* was distinguished from these *two lower* degrees derived from *Adam* as he was a *living Soul*. For the *Baptismal Spirit*, makes us *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, as far as we are capable of being so. Because the *Divine Spirit*, the *Third Person* in the *Trinity*, is the *Spirit of Christ* in whose *Humanity* the *Fulness* of that *Spirit* is said to dwell, being *anointed* with the *Oil of Gladness* above his *Brethren*. Of the *Fulness* all *Members* of his are said to receive and *Grace for Grace*. That is, so as that none has *all* as *he* has, and none has *any* but what *he* receives from *him*, and that each *Individual* Member has some wherein he resembles him, so far, at least, as to what *he* has received from *him*. This makes us one *Spirit*, as well as the *Water-Baptism* makes us one *Body* with him, which is the chief and most *beneficial* *Mystical Union* with *Him*.

The *Archetypal Ideal Man*, the $\delta \kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\alpha$, the *Man from Heaven*, to whom the Dominion over the Creatures is ascribed, and which is truly the *immortalizing Principle*, is ascrib'd to our *Saviour*, in 1 *Cor.* xv. and *Heb.* ii. Perfectly agreeable to the *Platonists*, who thought all the *Ideæ*, and therefore the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega\pi\omicron$ among the rest, to be in the $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. This seems indeed to be the same with the *Divine Spirit*, the *Third Person* of the *Trinity*, as it is in the *Spousal* of our *Lord*, as the *Spirit of Christ*. And with this *Adam* had been united if he had not fallen. And this was *God's designing* him to be *Immortal*, that *God* was pleased, by his good use of the $\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\eta$, to put this in union with that $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in his *Power*, by which he intended to immortalize him. But that was lost by the *Fall*, and it was the *sign* of the *Incarnation* to restore it by our *Christian Baptism*. Yet it is not so completely lost, but that we still retain some *immerings* of even that *Divine Light* in our *rational Souls*, as far as a *mortal Creature* is capable of retaining it. So *Tatian* concerning the *fallen Soul*; $\tau\omicron \delta\epsilon \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \epsilon\pi\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota \mu\eta \beta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\delta\eta\eta\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\iota$. $\epsilon\delta\epsilon \omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \epsilon\gamma\alpha\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha \tau\epsilon \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\tau\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta, \chi\epsilon \delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\epsilon \chi\omega\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu \tau\alpha \pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\alpha \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\alpha\nu \mu\eta \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta, \&c.$ This $\epsilon\gamma\alpha\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$ is the $\kappa\omega\rho\iota\varsigma$, in the *Proverbs*. And *Tatian* himself ascribes an affinity to it with the

51.

They also suppose the Reasonable Soul it self, to be a derivation from Christ, as the $\Lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$.

Spirit which has deserted it. So he tells us concerning *good Souls*; αἱ μὲν παιδομαρτυροῦσιν σοφία, σφίσι δὲ αὐταῖς ἐφέλκετο πνεῦμα συγγενές. And S. *Paul* seconds him in it, when he owns even *Gentile Souls* (who had *lost* the πνεῦμα by *Adam's Fall*, and had *not* recovered it by our *Saviour's Baptism*) to be of the γένος of *God*. This could be meant of nothing but the πνοή, the *Rational Soul*, as I have already observed. *Reason* therefore is taken for *Divine*, and as sufficient to entitle to the name of *God* in the *lower* sense as I have already shewn, from *Philo* and our *Saviour* himself. But I should, not so much regard *Tatian* in this matter if he had not the Suffrages of better Authorities.

Apolog. i.
p. 46.

i. His Master S. *Justin* owns an ἔμφυτον παντὸς γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τὸ λόγος. *Semen* is frequently used in this sense by the *Gnosticks* in *Irenæus*, for this *immortal Principle* of the *Spirit*, derived from their *Æons* and *Platonia*. And by S. *John* himself 1 Ep. iii. where the phrases of having the *Seed*, and being *born of God*, are used *Synonymously*. And S. *Justin* there opposes this σπέρμα τὸ λόγος to the λόγος τὸ παντός, which he says is *Christ*. This therefore can be nothing other than the ἑναυσμα of his Disciple *Tatian*. In his second *Apology* (which is really the *former* in time) he is more explicit. He there calls our Blessed Lord πρωτόγονον τὸ θεῶν, and λόγον, ὃ πᾶν γένος

ib. ii. p. 83.

ἑνὶ ὅρῳ μὲν ἔστι. And then subjoyns : καὶ
 μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες, χειρισαντο εἰς, καὶ
 οὗτοι ἐνομιθήσαν οἷον ἐν Ἑλληνισμῷ Σωκράτους
 Ἡράκλειτος, καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, &c. He
 had intencioned *Heraclitus* in his *other* Apo-
 logy with reference to this place, ὡς περὶ
 τῆς ἑτέρας, which, by the way, is another Ar-
 gument, that the second was truly the for-
 mer in order of time. His examples are of
Heathens, who could have no other Com-
 munication with *Christ*, but by this supreme
 part of their *Rational Souls*. Yet this he
 thinks sufficient to entitle them to the name
 of *Christians*, for living by that λόγος
 which was derived from the Ἀὐτολόγος, that
 may speak in the Language of the Pla-
 tonists. And he repeats it again afterwards:
 καὶ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες, καὶ βιούντες, χειρι-
 σαντο. The affinity of the λόγος in our Souls,
 and the *Fontal λόγος*, and the natural de-
 pendence on it as a λόγος, and the small
 and obscure remainder of the *Image of God*,
 which was lost by the fall of *Mankind*, will
 give an easie and clear account of these
 things (according to the *Platonick Hypo-*
thesis) which have been so censured as tri-
 fling, sporting upon words, by Persons,
 otherwise very learned, but not so parti-
 cularly versed in that *Philosophy* so frequent-
 ly alluded to in the *Scriptures*, as well as
 the earliest *Fathers*.

52. But for the clearer explication of the
 our Savi- difference between the Spirit in us, as the
 our, as Supreme constituent of our Human Nature
 Christ, and the Divine Spirit which we receive
 was anoin- from Christ, as the Principle that raises and
 ted in his Human ennobles and immortalizes us; it will not be
 Nature, by the ful- amiss to observe that the Spirit which over
 ness of the shadowed the Blessed Virgin at our Saviour
 Divine Incarnation was the Third, not the Second
 Spirit. Person of the Trinity. Our Creed obliges
 And, on us to own this, which professes that our
 that ac- Lord was conceived by the Holy Ghost. Thence
 count, as the Blessed Virgin is said to be *κεχαριτω*
 well as *μεν*, in being overshadowed by it, which
 that of the Right of it self the *χαρις*, and the Original of a
Δόξης, he the *χαριτες* and *χαρισματα* that are distr
 gained a buted among Men. Thence our Bless
 Right of Lord himself has the title of Christ or Me
 being sty- sias, from this Archetypical Unction, whi
 led the cannot agree to his Divine, but his Human
 Son of Nature. His Divine Nature neither need
 God. nor is capable of, any farther Sanctification
 But it is his Human Nature, that is anno
 ted with the oil of gladness above his fellow
 It is this, in which it has pleased the Father
 that all fulness should dwell. That is the
 Fulness of the Spirit, as opposed to the Grace
 for Grace by us received from him. It is
 this that the Fulness of the Godhead is said
 to dwell bodily. Not as if it self had a
 thing of a Body, but in opposition to the
 shadows of the Law, mentioned in the Epistle

to the *Hébrews*. So that the meaning is, that the *Divine Spirit* it self dwelt in our *Saviour*, not only by a *Visible Symbol* of the *Spirit*, such as were in the *Scheckinabs* that overshadowed the *Mercy seat*, or the *Clouds* of the *Tabernacle*, or the *Temple*, in the time of the *Law*. The Word therefore implies the *Original Spirit*, the *ἀντικείμενον* (to use the Phrase of the *Platonists*) in opposition to *sensible Representations* of it. Yet this *Spirit* is the ground why our *Saviour* is called the *Son of God*. So the *Evangelists* expressly : *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee : Therefore also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God*, S. *Luke* i. 35. This cannot be understood of the *Filiation* of the *Λόγος*, which is *eternal*. It must therefore be understood of another, that is only *temporary*; that is, of the *Man Christ Jesus*, as he is elsewhere called. Whereby the *Man* is the *Son of God*, and whereby *he* is the *first born* among many *Brethren*; that is, among many other *Men* who are *Sons of God* as well as *he*. They could not otherwise be called his *Brethren*. Nor is he called a *Son* on account of the *Miraculous* and *Extraordinary* manner of his *Humane Generation*, as the *Socinians* would have it, who are, by no means competent judges of these matters, whilst they neglect *original Authors* for the signification of *terms*

of Art. God is the God of the Spirits of all Flesh, Numb. xvi. 22. This makes all who partake of the Spirit of Christ, to have one God with him, as our Saviour himself speaks. And in this regard, the Father is the God as well as the Father of our Lord. And he is the Father of Lights, S. Jam. i. 17. Of this particularly which we receive in Baptism, from whence our Saviour's Baptism is itself called Illumination. This makes his Father our Father also. So Homer calls the Supreme Being *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*. And Kings particularly he calls *Διογενεῖς* as having the Divine Extraction on account of the Spirit of Government. Virgil indeed scruples it concerning Man. His appellation is, *Divûm pater, atq; hominum Rex*. Wherein he imitated his Roman Predecessor Ennius. But concerning the Gods the Greek and the Latin Poets agree. So he is *Pater optimus Divûm*, in Lucilius, and *Magnus Pater Divûm* in Persius, and *ReCTORq; Paterq;* in Ovid, Metam. ix. which would have oblig'd them to allow the same form of Speech for such Men also, as they had believed to have been Partakers of the Divine Nature, which is the case of the whole new Peculium. But it cuts off all pretences to God as a Father, from those Men who have no more than the essential Ingredients of the Humane Nature, which is the highest claim of the rest of Mankind. That glim-
mering

mering light that still remains in the Soul since the Fall, is not alone sufficient for it : It is *preternatural*, and *supernatural*. And it is not so *fixt*, as to continue the Soul in its Being beyond the *Resurrection*, or at least, the *Conflagration*, which is to follow the day of *Judgment*.

This Divine Spirit is, as I said, called a 53. Seed, not only in the *Philosophical* Traditions of the *Gnosticks*, but also in the *Scripture*. And it is the *Seed* of the *Father*, from whom it is said ἐκπορεύεται S. *John* xv. 26. A word very properly applicable to *Seed*, it must therefore entitle them who have it to the *first* Person in the *Trinity* as their *Father*, not the *second*. And the *Human Nature*, deriving its *Divine Extraction* from the same *Spirit*, could therefore give the *Divine Person*, on that account, no *higher* Relation to the *Members* of the *Peculium* than that of a *Brother*. If ἐκπορεύεται have relation to the notion of a *Seed*, it will determine the *Question* concerning the ἐκπορεύεται of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son*, in favour of the *Greeks*. For none pretends that the *Holy Ghost* did, in *this* sense, proceed from the *Son*, so as to make the *Son* his *Father*. Περσάμεν is the word generally used by the *Gnosticks* in *Ireneus*, which the *Latin* Interpreter renders *emittere*, when they speak of the *Active* production of their *Aeons*, to which ἐκπορεύεται would

That same Spirit being the Seed of the Father, but derived to us by our Saviour will make us the Sons of God, and Brethren of our Saviour.

would answer conveniently enough, on the part of the Being so produced. But this only by the way. However it is certain that our *Filiation* is derived from our *Participation* of this *Divine Spirit*. This is the *Spirit* of *Adoption*, by which we are qualified to cry *Abba Father*. This is the *Divine Nature* mention'd by S. Peter. This is the *Image* of him who is the *Image* of the invisible God. As Adam is said to be made after God's Image, and to beget a Son after his own Image. This is the *Spirit* which we receive in our *Christian Baptism*, which is the *Laver of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost*; wherein we are born again, not of *Water* only but also of the *Spirit*; wherein we are born, not of *Blood*, nor of the will of the *Flesh*, nor of the will of *Man*, but of *God* wherein we receive power to be called *Sons of God*; wherein we have that *Spirit* renewed in us, which we lost by *Adam* which is the new *Æliis* restoring the *original* with which *Adam* was created. Thus therefore by this *Participation* of the *Spirit* of *Christ*, we became related to his *Humanity*, as anointed with this *Oil* of gladness above his *Fellows*. And as he is the *Λόγος* also. So the *Platonists* too call him for the *Treasury* of all the *Idea*, and among others, of that of all the *Archetypes* *Man*, the *αὐτοάνθρωπος* or *ἄνθρωπος* ἐαυτοῦ.

And the *κεντήρ* of Nēs was lodged in the Sun, the *Archetypical Intellectual Sun*, which was the same with them as the *Divine λόγος*. So the *πνεῦμα* is the same with Christ, and the *Lord from Heaven*, in the Reasonings of S. Paul. And their Names are used promiscuously. The *Seed* of the Spirit is called the *incorruptible Seed* of the word of God, which lives and abides forever, 1 S. Pet. i. 23. and the word of God which is in us, 1 S. Job. i. 10. and which abides in us, 1 S. Job. ii. 14. And Christ in us, the hope of glory, Col. i. 17. By this we understand the occasion of the mistake of several of the earliest Latin Fathers especially, who confounded these two Titles of our Saviour to the Appellation of God; the one, that of his Person, as *Λόγος*, and the second Person of the Trinity: the other, as even his *Humane Nature* was consecrated by the *Fulness* of the *Divine Spirit*, the third Person of the same Trinity; which is the *Divine Nature* in the highest sense, and entitled him to the name of God in the same sense, as possessing it in its *Fulness*, as the *Fountain* of it; not only in its derivative Gifts and Graces, which was sufficient for the name of a God in the lower and popular Sense then received.

This term of *Abiding*, seems to have been chosen by the *Holy Ghost* to express a Prerogative of the Gospel. What is meant by that form of Speech, the

54.
The Spirit's abiding in us

the *peculiar* way of the *Spirit's* residing in *us* above that which the *Antients*, who lived before the Incarnation, could pretend to. So it is observed concerning the *Descent* of the *Holy Ghost* upon our *Saviour* himself, at his *Baptism*, by *S. John the Baptist*; ἐμείνεν ἐπ' αὐτόν, *S. John* i. 32. μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, v. 33. And *S. Mark* i. 10. in the *vulgar*. So the *Father* is said μένειν in the *Son*, *S. John* xiv. 10. And the *Holy Ghost*, the *Paraclete*, μένειν with *us*, and in *us*, and that for ever, v. 16, 17. And the *Father* and the *Son* are said μόνον ποιεῖν with *us*, v. 23. And the *Seed* of *God* is said μένειν in *him*, who is *begotten* of *God*, 1 *S. John* iii. 9. which *Seed* is the *Spirit* of *Adoption*, by which we are made *Sons*, and enabled to cry *Abba Father*. The same Expression is used concerning *God the Father* singly, 1 *S. John* iv. 12. 15, 16. And concerning the *Son* also. Which yet is known by his *Spirit*; ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουσιν ὅτι μένει ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ὃ ἡμεῖς ἔδωκεν, 1 *S. John* iii. 24. Thus we see that this Expression is used concerning all the three *Persons* of the *Trinity*, as far as they are pleased to admit *us* to the *mystical* ἐνωσις and *κoinωνία* with themselves, which is the *peculiar Prerogative* of the *Gospel Dispensation*, and the *new Peculium*. And it certainly signifies much more than any Expression used concerning the *Influence*

the *Holy Spirit* on the *antient* Prophets before the *Resurrection*, which is the *Epocha* of giving the *Spirit* by the Doctrine of the *New Testament*. Even then the *Spirit* is said to have *come* upon them, to have *fallen* upon them, to have *ruſhed* upon them, and that *mightily*. But its *abiding* on any, seems to have been reserved for our *Saviour's Triumph*, as a ſingular *Recommendation* of his *munificence* on this Occaſion. What then can be meant by its *abiding* in *Angels*? Certainly a more *laſting* Poſſeſſion of it, than was imported by any of *theſe* Expreſſions uſed concerning the *Inſpirations* mentioned in the *Old Testament*. And indeed their *Inſpirations* were very ſhort of ours under the *Gospel* in *this* particular alſo. *ſame* *Abraham* had true *Inſpirations*, who neither was of the *choſen People*, nor a good and well diſpoſed *Man*, fit for receiving the *Prophetic Spirit*. So alſo *Saul*, though of the *good Peculium*, yet after the *Spirit of God* departed from him, and after he was abandoned by *God*, and expoſed to the *Inſpirations* of an *Evil Spirit*, then certainly unworthy of the *good Spirit*. Yet he alſo *profeſſed* when, in purſuit of *David*, he came among the *Prophets*, under the Preſidency of *Samuel*. Neither of theſe *Motions* could have been any more than what the *ſchool* call *Prophetic Inſtincls*, which require no *Purity of the Recipients*, but might,

as

as *God* saw good, have been communicated to very *wicked* Persons. These were confessedly *Prophets*, no otherwise than occasionally. But there were also *true Prophets* who cannot be thought *inspired* with the *Prophetick Spirit constantly*. Such was the *old lying Prophet*, who deceived the *true Prophet*, who was sent to denounce *Judgment* against the *Altar* erected by *Jerobam*. Yet even *he* was made use of for denouncing *Judgment* against the *better Prophet*, who had been *deluded* by him on a *false Pretence* of a *Divine Inspiration*. Such were all the *true Prophets* of *Abab's Kingdom of Israel*, excepting *Micaiah*, whom *God* permitted them all to be themselves *deceived* by a *lying Spirit*. Nor could any of them all *prophezie* when themselves *pleased*. The *High-Priest* himself could not pretend to it, without his *Oracle of Urim* or the *Water of Jealousie*, or such other *instituted Means* for receiving the *Influence of the Spirit*. Nor could any of the *Prophets* exercise it, but as they were *stirred up* by the *Spirit* it self. Accordingly the *extraordinary Afflations* were either *given* or *denied*, as *God* was *pleased* to favour or punish the *Publick*, for whose *Use* the *Gifts of the Spirit* were designed, which were given *then*. Therefore *Saul* could have no *Responses* at all by any of the *Means* then allowed for giving *Divine Oracles*. N

not even in the Case of *Jonathan*, when he
 had ignorantly incurred his Father's *Imprecation*.
 And the *failing* of the *Prophetic* Spirit,
 is taken for one of the most disconsoling
 Circumstances of the Condition of the
 old *Peculium*, after their return from the
Babylonish Captivity. Nor could any *Personal*
Piety secure the *Continuance* of those
Gifts of the *Spirit* then, which were not
 given as the Rewards of *Personal Piety*, but
 for the use of *others*, rather than of the
 persons who were favoured with them. Even
 the *Spirit of Prayer and Supplication* then
 mentioned, was an *Excitation* to *Prayers*
 for their *temporal Deliverances* from Publick
 Calamities. It was a *Token* that *God* would
 hear such *Prayers* for the *Publick*, when he
 was pleased, by his *Spirit*, to raise a *zealous*
 and *ardent* Concern for the *publick*, in
 persons eminently *Pious*, which might vent
 itself in *Prayers* for the *Publick*; though
 otherwise the Case might sometimes fall out,
 that even *fervent Prayers* might not be
 available for the removal of *temporal Calamities*
 from the *common Body*. But the *abiding*
 of the *Spirit* in us, which is *proper* to
 the *Gospel*, relates to the Good of the Soul
 of him who is so happy as to be *entitled* to
 it, and depends not on the *Behaviour* of
 others, if he, who has it, be not *wanting* to
 himself in qualifying himself for its *Continuance*.
 And therefore it is as *lasting* as the
 Person

Person is true to the *Disposition* required of his part, which the *Scripture* calls *abiding in God and Christ*, and in the *Truth*, and in the *Unity of the Spirit*, in order to the securing the *Benefits* of the *Cœlestial Mystical Communion*. This is that which the *Old Testament* never pretends as a *Benefit* of the *old Dispensation*. But where-ever it speaks of it, it is only by way of *Prediction*, of what should be performed in the *latter Day*, by which it always understands the times of the *Gospel*, according to the *Interpretation* of the *Apostles*, and the *other Writers* of the *New Testament*. *Μένειν* therefore implies such an *abiding* of the *Spirit* in *us*, as agree to an *Inhabitant*, not to a *Stranger* or *Traveller*, who designs *no long stay*. So the *Disciples* meant in their question to our Saviour, *Πε μένεις*; *Where dwellest thou?* They desired to know the place of his *fixt abode*. *S. John i. 39*. So the *μένεσαι πάντες*, *Ebr. xii. 14*. is opposed to the *uncertainty* of the *abode* of *Strangers* and *Pilgrims*. Such was that of the *Israelites* in their passage from *Egypt* to *Canaan*. And such as we are all supposed to be in while we are in the *World*, our *Mystical Egypt*, where we are *Sojourners* in our way to the *Mystical Canaan*, our *Heavenly Countrey*. So the *Sage* of *Sirach* makes *Wisdom*, after her *Travels* through *all Nations*, to *fix* her *Habitat* in *Israel*, *Eccl. xxiv. 13*. But this seems of

to have related to her *Government* of that
Nation as a *Theocracy*, not to her *dwelling*
 in their *Persons*, and qualifying *them* for
supernatural Benefits. The *Hellenists* then
 seem to have had no Notion of the *Inhabi-*
itation of the Spirit in *us*, as in *Temples*. And
 the *Apostolical Writers* refer the Passages of
 the *Old Testament* Prophecies, which inti-
 mate it, to the State of the Gospel. So *S. Paul*,
Cor. vi. 16. So also his *Colleague Apostle* of
 the Gentiles, *Barnabas* in his *Catholick Epi-*
stle, c. 16. Yet *Seneca*, Ep. 41. and *Hiero-*
clitus on the *Golden Verses*, mention the like
habitation of a *Divine Spirit* in *Men*, as at-
 tainable by *Philosophy*, which *Clemens Alex-*
andrinus also mentions, and allows it. This
 is singular and proper to the *new Peculium*.
 much more so, that every particular
Christian should thus receive the Spirit by
 the same *Baptism*, that initiated him into
 the *Privileges* of the *Christian Society*. That
 should thus be now taught of God imme-
 diately; by the God that made him his *Tem-*
ple, by the *Unction*, from whence he re-
 ceived the Name of *Christian*, a Deriva-
 tion from that which gave our Lord the
 title of *Christ* or *Messias*, on which ac-
 count we are not only *Christians*, but
ointed, or *Christs*, in the Language of
 the *Psalmist*. It is therefore a *fixt Habita-*
tion of the Spirit, that is signified by this
 word *μένειν*, or *abiding*, in the *New Testa-*
ment;

ment ; not *single* and *occasional* Inflation of it, such as those were, which were, for some time, *common* under the *old Dispensation*. Not only so : The same *Word*, as is used in *Scripture*, signifies an *Eternal Abode*, and is therefore very proper for denoting a *Principle of Immortality*. So the words *for ever*, are frequently joined with it, *Pf.* xxxiii. 11. lxxxix. 36. cxi. 3. 10. cxii. 3. 9. cxvii. 2. *Is.* xl. 8. *S. John* xii. 3. *Ebr.* vii. 3. 24. And, even when the *Words* are not added, yet the *Word μέν* implies them. So the *κρείττων ὑπαρξίς ἔρανε* καὶ μένουςα, *Ebr.* x. 30. And the *μένουςα πάλιν ἢ μέλλουςα*, *Ebr.* xiii. 14. Both place speak of the *Cælestial Archetypes*, which are always, in this *Platonical Reasoning* of the *New Testament*, supposed *Eternal*. So the *βρώσις μένουςα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, *S. John* vi. 27. It seems opposed to the *Word παράγειν* concerning the *Enjoyments of this World*, which shew how *uncertain* they are and *transitory*. So, *παράγει τὸ σῆμα τῷ κόσμῳ τέτε*, *I Cor.* vii. 31. *Ἡ σαρξία παράγειται*, *I S. John* ii. 26. *Ὁ κόσμος παράγειται*, v. 17. Yet even the *Words εἰς αἰῶνα* are added on this very Occasion of speaking of the *Spirit*. Our *Saviour* promises to pray the *Father* to give the *Spirit*, *ἵνα μένη μετ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ αἰῶνα*, *S. John* xiv. 16. And we are said to be *born again*, *of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible*, *λόγῳ ζωῆς διὸ καὶ μένοντες εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*

S. Pet. i. 23. This *Seed*, by which we are born again, is no other than the *Baptismal Spirit*. This is the *Seed* which abides in us, 1 S. John iii. 9. And the *Life* to which we are here begotten, is called a ζώντων εν αὐτῷ μένειν, 1 S. John iii. 15. And the *Sonship* to which this *Spirit of Adoption* entitles us, gives us a *Right* to abide, μένειν, in *God's House*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, S. John viii. 5. And the same form of *Speech* is made use of concerning the *Punishment* of the breach of our *Baptismal Covenant*: Ἡ ὁρμή σου δεῦρ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν, S. John iii. 36. Ἡ ἀγρία ὑμῶν μένει, ix. 41. Where *Sin* is taken for the *Punishment* of *Sin*, as when it is said, *your Iniquity shall find you out*. So μένει ἐν δολατίῳ, 1 S. John iii. 14. by which we may easily gather, that this is to be eternal also: So that both States are immortalized by this *Divine Spirit*, which had not been so without it.

Indeed its entitling us to *Heaven*, sufficiently shews it to be a distinct Principle from our *Human Souls*; even from that part of them which was from the *Divine Breath*. The place for separate *Souls*, is the *Air*, not *Heaven*, any otherwise than the *Air* has the Name of *Heaven* also, as the *Heaven* of the *Blessed* is called the *Heaven* of *Heavens*, by way of *Contradistinction* from this lower *Heaven*. That really "Aḡs the *Receptacle* of good, as

R

well

55.

The same Distinction appears in this, that the Air is the proper Abode for separate Souls; but Heaven is the proper Abode of the Spirit.

well as wicked Souls, till the Resurrection according to the *Antients*. So Origen understood the Passage of S. John; The sea gave up the dead which were in it: and death and hell delivered up the dead that were in them, Rev. xx. 13. *Ut ego puto mare hic pro humido omni appellatum est elemento, infernus autem pro aere, mors vero pro terrâ.* His Words are from Pamphilus the Martyr, in his *Apology* for him, out of his Work *de Resurrectione*. The Word used by the Sacred Writers for Hell, or *Infernus*, is *Adns*, and it agrees very well with his Design, that when the Grave, which is meant by Death, gave up the Bodies as well as the Sea, *Adns* also should give up the Souls there deposited, in order to their *Re-union* at the Resurrection. This is paraphrased by the Apocryphal *Esdra*s, in these Words *The Earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the Dust those that dwell in silence, and the secret Places shall deliver those Souls that were committed unto them* 2 *Esd.* vii. 32. This Author might have had this place of the *Revelations* in view when he wrote this, as he seems to have had several other Passages of that famous mysterious Book in other places. And he lived in so near Memory of S. John, that he might very well know how the *Christians* of that Age understood him, for whose use the *Holy Ghost* designed it. He is certain

not only elder than S. Ambrose, who
 quotes this very Passage from him, *de Bon.*
Mort. c. 10. than Origen himself, who very
 probably took what he has here from him ;
 but than even Origen's Master, Clemens Ale-
 xandrinus, who quotes this Book, though
 not this Passage. *Promptuaria* is the Word
 in our present Translation, but in S. Am-
 brose it is *Habitacula* ; perhaps οἰκηθρία
 in the Greek, as will appear hereafter. *Ha-*
bitaculum is the Term used by the antient
 Author, *de tribus habitaculis*, by whom it
 appears to have been in the middle, between
 Heaven and Hell, and distinct from both of
 them. Like the Gnostick *status medietatis*,
 distinct from the *Pleroma*, as well as this
 lower World, and by them allotted for such
 Souls, as were not of the spiritual Seed. So
 strange an Agreement there is among all the
 primitive Christians, Hereticks as well as
 Catholicks, in this Matter. The Fathers
 were so agreed in it, that our most learned
 Bishop Pearson has expounded the Article
 of the Descent into Hell, of the Descent of
 our Saviour's Soul into this common Custody
 of Souls, as Lactantius calls it, that his
 Death might be every way like ours ; that
 his Soul might, upon its Dissolution from the
 Body, go to the common Receptacle of Souls,
 as his Body did to the Grave, which is to
 receive all our Bodies. That was a Point
 which was then believed of greater Conse-

A'p. Usher
 against
 Mal. of
 Limb.
 Patr. p.
 255. Ed.
 Lond.
 1686.

quence, than we may think it now. The Scandal of the *Cross* made the *Hereticks* of those times generally, as well as the *Gentile Infidels*, *unwilling to believe* that the *Supreme Being* could condescend so far as to *die like us*. However, that this is the *place for separate Souls*, and that *none*, or *very few* of them, go to the places of their *ultimate Reward or Punishment*, till the day of *Judgment*, the *first Antients* were generally agreed, and the *Greeks* to this very day, and many *late*, as well as *great*, Authorities even among the *Latines* themselves. Such were *S. Bernard*, and *Pope John XXII*. Such, even of the *Romish Communion*, *Mr. White*, *de medio Animarum statu*, to name no more. And, in our own Church, my great and honoured Patron *Bishop Taylor*, and the very learned and judicious *Mr. Thorndike*. And that this *middle space* is *Ἄδης*, appears from *Homer* the first Author of that *λέξις* that we know of. He places *Tartarus*, ἰλ——ῑ.

Τόσσον ἐγερῑ αἶδω ὅσον ἑρηνός ἐς ἀπείρας.

He plainly divides the *Subcælestial World* into *two Spaces*: The one from *Heaven* to our *Earth*, which he calls *Ἄδης*; the other from the *Earth downwards*, which was his *Tartarus*. So *Hesiod* understood him

when he repeated his Words : Only with this Difference ; that instead of *ἐνερθ' αἰ-*
θ'ω, he thought fitter to express it *ἐνερθ'*
αἰθ'ω *γῆς*, by which it appears more plainly,
 that he took our *Earth* for the *lowest* Bound
 of *Αἰθ'ω*. So *Lucretius*, L. IV. also ;

*Despectum præbet sub terras impete tanto,
 A terris quantum, cæli patet altus hiatus.*

He there alludes to *Homer's* Words, tho' he does not use them concerning the same thing. Yet his *Allusion* to the Words is sufficient for my Purpose, to shew that the *Earth* was taken for the *Bound* of *Homer's* *Αἰθ'ω*. So *Virgil* also, *Aeneid* VI.

Tum Tartarus ipse

*Bis patet in præceps, tantum tenditque sub
 umbras,
 Quantus ad æthereum, cæli suspectus Olym-
 pum.*

The Phrase, *ire sub umbras* with him, an-
 swers that of *Homer*, αἰθ'ω δὲ βελήξει.
 by which it appears, that *Αἰθ'ω* is the
 place with him as the place of the *umbras*,
 which he means the *separate Souls*, as
 invested with those *subtil Bodies*, which
 give them a *Shape*, and a *Capacity* of
 appearing to our *Senses*, and of suffering
 corporeal Impressions, according to the

MSOxon.
Seld. olim.
Chr. Lon-
golii. p.
153.

Antients. These are *Homer's* ψυχῶν εἰδῶν θανόντων. This therefore can be no other than the *Air*. Accordingly *Vettius Valens* *Antiochenus* makes that the place of separate Souls, and proves it by the Testimony of the *Orphick* and other *Oracles*, which were of great *Authority* with the *Philosophers* of these *lower Ages*.

His words are these, Πελαγοδρομήσας ὁ

ε MS. καὶ πολλὰ γὰρ διόδους, κλιμάτων τε
ἔδνων κατόπτης γινόμενος πολυχρονία πε-
ρὶ πόνοισι συνεμφορῆς ἡξιώθην ὑπὸ τῆς δεῖς καὶ
περὶ νόσας βεβαίως καὶ ἀσφαλῆς λιμένος τυχε-
ῖον γὰρ φθαρεὰ πάντα καὶ μοχθηρὰ ἐλαχνοὶ ἀ-
δρωποι. Ἔστι δὲ πρὸς καὶ θεῖον ἐν ἡμῖν θεόπνε-
στον δημέργημα. Ὅγε περιεχυμένος
ειν MS. ἀφθαρίος ὑπαρχων καὶ διήκων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπόρροα
καίρικλῶς ἀθανασίας ἀπονέμει πακτῶ καὶ
μετρημένῳ χρόνῳ. ὡς ἕκαστος ἡμῶν
ἡμέραν μελεῖται γυμναζόμενος λαμβάνειν,
ἀποδιδόναι τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα, καὶ δὲ
θεότατος Ὀρφεὺς λέγει.

ν MS.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔρριζωται
καὶ ἄλλως.

μεδ MS.

Ἄερα δ' ἐλκοντες ψυχῶν θεῖαν δρεπόμεθα
ἄλλως.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρω ἐκ Διὸς ἐκ-
κρίσθη ἄλλως.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀθάνατος πάντων, τὰ δὲ σώματα ἀν-
θρώπων

"Ενθεν ἐφ' ὅσον ἔχοντο τὴν ψυχὴν κινέμεθα,
 καὶ ὁμιλοῦμεν, καὶ πράττομεν, καὶ μηχανώμεθα,
 καὶ ποιῶμεν, ἔργα ἰσόδεα. Ὅποτε δ' εἰς τὴν
 αἴρα ἀναδραμῇ τὸ χρέος· πρὸκειται σῶμα
 κενὸν ἀναυδον, κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἑτέραν τὸ πνεύ-
 μα [μὴ I think should be added for the
 sense] συγκεχωρηκός, κενὸν εἰμαρμένης, [in
 opposition to the θεῖον δημιουργημα θεό-
 πνουςον, when it had the Spirit from the
 Air,] δημιουργημα. [add θεῶν alluding to the
 ἔργα ἰσόδεα before mentioned,] ἐδεγός ὃν
 θεοκλήρον. Τῆς γὰρ φύσεως [why not rather
 πνεύσεως or φύσεως?] ἀναλυθείσης εἰς τὴν
 οὐκείον τόπον ἐλέγχεται τότε τὸ θεῖον σῶμα.
 The Author is not extant, nor is the
 MS. common. Both will recommend the
 giving his words to the curious Reader.
 His beginning is plainly an imitation of
 Critodemus, one of the antientest Writers
 of Judicial Astrology. That Author's words
 Vettius Valens has preserved as follows:
 Ὅς σφώταται. Κεῖνός ἐστι ἐν τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ
 αὐτοῦ Ὁρασις συνεκτικωτάτη πλῶν μαρ-
 τυρίων ἀρχὴν τοιαύτην ἐπισημαίνει. "Ἡδὲ πῶς
 πελαγοδρομήσεις καὶ πολλὴν ἔρημον διόδουςαι
 ἢ ξιῶσιν ὑπὸ θεῶν λιμέν. ἀκινδύνως τυχεῖν
 καὶ μὴν ἀσφαλεστάτης. By which we un-
 derstand the Pains and Industry both these
 Authors used in accomplishing themselves
 in this superstitious and uncertain Science.
 Which will make them both the more re-
 gardable in their kind. Then it is obser-

The Distinction between

able how differently these two Heathen Authors speak concerning the Divinity owned by them. What *Critodemus* expresses in the plural number ὑπὸ Θεῶν, that *Vettius Valens* mentions in the singular number only ὑπὸ Θεῶ, both of them according to the custom of their Age. The *Philosophers*, after our Saviour's time, introduced that new Form of Speech, making their Addresses rather to the Supreme Being immediately, than to the Popular Deities, and by reducing all of them to the Sun, in favour of *Alagabalus*, as appears in *Macrobius*. This Work is an *Anthology*, collected out of the eldest and best Authors of the kind, together with his own Observations and Improvements in this Book, to which this *Preface* belongs. This was the way also of *Julius Firmicus*, an Author whose Age is better known. This makes it very difficult to determine the *Collector's Age* from the *Astrological Calculations* mentioned in it, because it is so difficult to distinguish whose the Calculations are, whether of the *Collector*, or of some of the *Authors* out of whom he made his Collection. The latest Note that I have observed in a cursory view of him, is of the xxi Year of *Antoninus Pius*. The *Collector* mentions one Βάλης. If this be the same with *Vettius Valens*, the *Collector* cannot be *Vettius Valens* but some later Man, who has excerpted *Vettius*

thus as well as others. Whoever he be, he
 makes the *Air* to be the place of *separate*
Divine Souls, and that *part* of the *Air*
 which has also the Appellation of *Æther*.
 And he takes this to have been the Sense
 of the *Divine Orpheus*, whom the *Heathen*
 thought inspired, and reckon for one of
 their first Θεόλογοι, in the same sense as
 S. John the Evangelist and S. Gregory Nazi-
 anzen, are called also Θεόλογοι, as obser-
 ving the *Phraseology* of the most antient De-
 rivars of *Tradition* from the freshest Memo-
 ry of what Mankind had received from the
 Divine Revelations, before the Divine fami-
 liar Conversation with Mankind was inter-
 rupted. From this *Æther* he derives the
 ζωα of Souls, as the *Pythagoreans*, in
 their *Golden Verses*, make the *Elements* the
 ζωα of all sublunary Bodies. So our
Microcosm is compared to a *Tree* having its
 Root in *Heaven*, and the πλεαχίς is made
 the παρὰ αἰθέρος φύσις by the same *Pytha-*
goreans. So our Author also makes our
 Death to be a payment of a debt to that
 same *Air* from whence we received our
 Souls, ὅπου πρὸς τὴν αἰέρα ἀναδραμῇ τὸ χρέος.
 So Death is commonly called the τὸ χρέος,
 as this Return of our Souls to the *Air* from
 whence they first came, is, in the Language
 of the *Scripture*, a Return of our Spirits up-
 wards to God that made them. It is here
 called ἀνάλυσις εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον τόπον. Exactly

as

The Distinction between

as in *S. Paul*; ὁ καιρὸς τῆ ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως ἐφύσθη, 2 *Tim.* iv. 6. πρὸς ὑπὲρ μέαν ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι, καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶ, *Phil.* i. 23. As our ἐκδήμις ἐκ τῆ σώματος is our ἐκδήμις πρὸς τὸ κύριον, 2 *Cor.* 5. 8. whom we are to meet εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα, 1 *Thess.* iv. 17.

So also *Hermes Trismegistus* in *Stobæus*: Τὸ ὅ ἀπὸ σελήνης, ὡ τέκνον, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ψυχῶν ὅσιν οἰκῆθαι, which afterwards he calls *Air*. This was the *Egyptian Philosophy* of those times, which all bore the name of *Hermes*, as the *Chaldaic* bore the name of *Zoroastres*, and the *Pythagoreans* wrote many of them under the name of their Master *Pythagoras*. And it is manifest, how much influence that *Egyptian Hypothesis* had, not only on the earliest *Hereticks*, who were many of them *Egyptians*, but also on the *Catholicks* themselves, as they expressed their *Divine Revelation* in the Language of the *Hellenists*, who had no where more flourishing Colonies than in *Egypt*, and the *Greek* parts of *Africa*, which depended on it. Here we have the *Greek Word* exactly answering the word *habitaculum* mentioned in the antient *Latin Authors* now produced. This therefore is the Ἄδης which contains both sorts of *Souls* in it till the day of *Judgment*, the *Bad* as well as the *Good*. Accordingly it has sometimes the name of *Heaven*, sometimes of *Hell*, which has occasioned considerable mistakes in the lower

Fathers

Fathers who did not observe it. Especially *S. Augustine*, who rather pleased himself in Reasoning from *received* Opinions, than in consulting *Originals*. It was the *lower Heaven*, as partaking of *Light*; and the *uppermost Hell*, as partaking of that *Darkness* which is the *Characteristick* of those Regions which we call *Infernal*. This *Distinction* of both States is commonly owned by the Writers of that *Age*, *Sacred* and *Prophane*, as well as by the modern *Rabbins*. And the *Revolutions* of *Night* and *Day* were sufficient to make them believe the *Air* inhabited both by *good* and *bad* Spirits, according to the *Reasonings* of those *Times*. For they judged of the *Mystical Light* and *Darkness*, by the *Light* and *Darkness* that was *sensible*. The *Heavens* therefore properly so called (having no *returns*, nor *mixture* of *Darkness*) they assigned to the *pure Spirits*, which had no *Contagion* of *Matter* or *material Affections*. And, on the contrary, there being no access of *Light* to the *Subterraneous* Regions, they were accordingly allotted to the *worst* of *Spirits*, that were at the *furthest* distance and opposition to the *Mystical Light*. It was therefore agreeable, That the *middle space* between both, having its *Vicissitudes* of the *sensible Light* and *Darkness*, should be possessed by *suitable* Inhabitants of *both* sorts, but *neither* of them so *absolute* in their kinds as those were who

The Distinction between

who were lodged in the *pure Light* and the *unmixed Darkness*. Yet, though both *sorts* be in the same *Space*, they were supposed to have different *Residences*, and in different *Bodies*, so as to have no *Communion* with each other. That is plainly implied in the *great Gulph* fixed between them, mentioned in the Parable of the *Rich Man* and *Lazarus*, and where the *Apostle* denies all *κoinωνία* between *Light* and *Darkness*. Meaning such as he supposes between the *Members* of those different *Bodies* respectively, and among themselves. And indeed the *Grossness* of their *Vehicles* was sufficient to *cause* that Distinction of their situation, according to that *Philosophy* which is alluded to by the *Sacred Writers* of the *New Testament*. That *Grossness* was occasioned by their *Aversion* to *Heavenly* things in this *Life*, and their having preferred *Material* Enjoyment before them. Accordingly they who had most immersed themselves in *Corporeal* Pleasures, contracted thereby the heaviest grossest *Vehicles*, which naturally depressed them to the lower Places, in proportion to their *Earthly* inclinations here; which did withal possess them with the most vicious *Habits*, and the most devilish *Delights* in doing *Mischief* and the most devilish *Aversion* to the *Society* of those who were better and most religiously disposed. Thus the distance between them would result from

cl. Windet.
de Vit.
funct. stat.
§. 13.

from the several *Dispositions* of the *lowest happy Soul*, and the *Supreme* of those which were *unhappy*, and the *corporeal Gravity* of their *ἄδωλον* consequent to those *Dispositions*. And there must be the like *distance* among *Souls* of the *same* rank as there was between their *Immersion* in *Matter*, consequent to the *Habits* contracted by the different use of their *Free-will*, when they were yet in their *Bodies*. However, though there were no *Conversation* between *happy* and *unhappy Souls*: Yet the *Devils* (at least, that *less defiled* part of them which were only excluded from *Heaven*, but suffered to exercise their *Authority*, like *Princes*, in the *darkness* of the *Air*) must consequently have a liberty of *ranging* so far as that *darkness* of the *Air* reached, and so far as the extent of *ὕλη*, of which they were the *Managers* for *mischievous* Purposes. This was indeed as far as the *Moon*, which was taken for the *Crater* of *Souls* designed for *Bodies*. This was the *lowest* Orb of those *Bodies*, which, in an *appropriated* sense, were taken for *Cœlestial*. And thus far the power of *Evil Spirits* was commonly thought to extend in *Eclipses* of the *Moon*, which were, for some time, ascribed by the *Vulgar*, to the influence of such *Spirits* endeavouring to offer violence to the *Moon*, by the practices of *Witches*, with whom they corresponded. These *Spirits* therefore they

they pretended to *affright* away by *Noises*. And, when they had attained more Skill in *Astronomy*, and knew that the *cause* of that *Darkness* was the *Interception* of the *Sun's Light*, by the *Interposition* of the *Earth* between the *Sun* and the *Moon*; yet that *Darkness* was sufficient, on that *Hypothesis*, to make it reduceable to the *Dominion* of the *Prince of Darkness*. And this is the *Slavery* to *Death* and the *Devil*, to which *Mankind* was condemned by *Adam's Fall*, that, whereas *God* designed *Man* for *Immortality*, by that *Union* with the *Immortalizing Spirit*, which *God* was pleased to put in his *Power* at his first *Creation*; when he had, by his own *Fault*, lost that *Spirit*, he was, from that time, confined to the *Region of Mortality*, the *Kingdom of Death*, which was *natural* to him; and thereby made *subject* to him who has the *power* of *Death*, that is, the *Devil*, *Ebr. ii.* His having the *power* of that *Kingdom of Death*, implies him to be the *Prince* of that *ἐμπραξία*. And so indeed he is, is the *Prince* of this *World*, of the *Darkness* of it, which is the *Region of Mortality*, relating to the *invisible State*, which is signified by the Word *Ἄδης*. Thus all *Mankind* were made obnoxious to that *Government*, which was allowed the *Devil* by *God* himself, after his *Expulsion* from *Heaven*. But no farther than *God* had been pleased to

now it him, and with those *Restrictions*
 which God had reserved, for the *Good* of
 those whom he should be pleased to take
 into his own *Protection*, and the *Guard* of
 those good *Angels* who officiated under him
 as *ministring Spirits*, for the good of the
Heirs of Salvation, Ebr. i. 14. This was
 really a right of the *Peculium*, as they were
 in a *Theocracy*, under the immediate Govern-
 ment of the *Λόγος*, and not committed by
 him, like other Nations, to a subordinate
 Government by *Tutelar Angels*. And this
 was such a *Curb* to the *νοσμοκρατορες* as con-
 fined their Power over such Souls to very
 narrow Bounds, even whilst the Souls them-
 selves were, by the *Grossness* of their *shady*
Bodies, confined within those *Jurisdications*,
 wherein they were allowed an *Exercise* of
 Power by the *Laws* of their *Creator*. For
 these separate Souls are said to be with the
 Lord, to return to him that gave them; and
 so, that no *Torment* can touch them. So the
Hellenists, *Wisd.* iii. 1. and every way a-
 greeably to the *inspired Writings*. The
Protection is certainly greater there than in
 this World, as God and good Spirits are more
 present there, and as the Power of the God
 of this World must needs be greater, where
 the Matter is grosser and more impure. Yet,
 even here, the Devil himself gives this ac-
 count of God's Providence over Job: Hast
 thou not made a hedge about him, and about
 his

his house, and about all that he hath on every side? *Job* i. 10. I know not therefore wherein this *Slavery* of these *separate happy Souls* to the *Devil* could consist, unless possibly, in obliging them to appear here below, against their *own Wills* in Compliance with those *Laws of Providence*, which suffered it, for Reasons concerning the good Government of our *World*, though unknown to us. For *Porphyry*, in *Stobæus*, tells us that *Souls* which have passed the *Styx*, for
ubi supra. get their Concerns here, but without retaining such an *Aversion* for all their *past Acquaintance* here, as never to appear to any willingly, nor without the *Authority* of *Pluto* and *Proserpine*, obliging them to do so. That they make to have been the Case of *Alceſtis* granted to *Hercules*, and of *Eurydice* to *Orpheus*. Both of them by *Pluto* and *Proserpine*. That *Prince* of the *Darkness* of this *Air*, is the same with the *Pluto* of the *Poets*, the *Lord* of *Ad's*. And could be no other than he that obliged the *Soul* of *Samuel* to appear and give *Response* to *Saul*, on account of the *Necromantic* Adjurations of the *Witch* of *Endor*. That he was forced to do so, appears by his own Words; *why hast thou disquieted me?* which are not the Words of one that came willingly, nor of a good Man coming by the Command of God. Yet the *eldest Jews* thought it no *Disparagement* to their *Patriarch*

belie

believe him to have been *real Samuel* that was so *disquieted*. The Son of *Sirach* thought so, *Eccl.* xlvii 23. and reckons it among his Glories, that, even then, he *prophesied*: Nor does *Josephus* intimate the least Doubt of it, where he relates the Story, *Ant.* vi. 15. These are the eldest *Jewish* Authors, next the *Scriptures*, that mention it, of whose *time* we are certain. The eldest *Christian Writer*, who takes notice of it, is *Justin Martyr*; and he is full in the point, not only concerning *Samuel*, but concerning the *Souls* of all *righteous Men*, and *Prophets*: Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ὅτι πάντες αἱ *Dial. cum Tryph. P. 333.* ψυχὰς τῶν ἑταίρων δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν ὑπὸ ἐξουσίας ἐπιπλέον τῶν τοιούτων δυνάμεων, ὅποια δὴ καὶ τῇ ἐγλατρίμω ἐκείνῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖται. So *Origen* also (that *Orig. de Engastrimurho.* Master of the Church next the *Apostles*, as *Jerome* styles him before his *Quarrels* concerning him.) I say this very *Origen*, in a last Discourse of this Subject, though not so consistently with his Hypothesis of the *natural Immortality of Human Souls*. So also *Anastasi- 'Osnj. q. 112.* us *Antiochenus* expressly asserts, that *all* the *Souls*, as well of the *Saints* as of the *Wicked*, were under the *Power* of the *Devil*, till they were delivered by *Christ*. And he expounds the Words of *S. Paul*, that *death* that is, says he, the *Devil*) *reigned over all* from *Adam* to *Moses*. But the Instance of *Samuel* shews, that this *Power* is not to be

S

confined

confined to the time of *Moses*. All are supposed by *S. Justin* to be in the same Condition, even *since Christ*. And that he gives as the Reason of the Prayers of the Church for departing Souls, that they might be delivered from the Molestations of these Evil Angels, and interprets a Passage of the *Psalmist* to this Purpose. This I believe might be the Occasion of those antient Liturgies produced by Primate *Usher*, wherein we find Prayers for Patriarchs, Prophets, the Apostles, the Martyrs, even the Blessed Virgin her self, though those Ages, where in those Liturgies were introduced, had entertained the highest Opinions of *happiness*, beyond that of any mere Creature. Not only as owning them all as one Body with the Militant Church on Earth, but as believing them to need their Prayers whilst they were in those separate Mansions accessible by the Devil. This was the Case of those who sinned without a positive Law, such as *Adam* had, and did, in regard to the generality of Mankind, expire with *Moses*; yet it is certain, that the Kingdom of Death did not do so. The Apostle reckons Death as the last Enemy that shall be subdued by our Lord, 1 Cor. xv. 26. not certainly till the general Resurrection. So long therefore even these good Souls must be some way under him who has the *κράτος* of that *αἰῶνα*. I have already shewn, that even

the *Apostles* were thought to go to *Adms*, by the Apostolical *Hermas*. Yet these are reckoned in the *Scripture* and the same *Hermas*, as the *Foundations* of the *Church*, next to *Christ* the chief corner *Stone*, in Allusion to the Passage of the *Psalmist*, on which *all* the other Members of the *Church* are to be superstructed. Thence it appears, that even new baptized Persons, and *Martyrs* (whose Case is believed equal to that of those who die in their *Baptismal Purity*) being incorporated into the same *Body* with the *Apostles*, and built upon them, cannot be exempted from that *State*, to which the *Apostles* themselves are liable. And, if these be not exempted, I know none others that can pretend to it. Nor can I perceive any Inconvenience in it, so long as this *Slavery* to the *Devil* does not make them obnoxious to any *Pains* that can be inflicted by the *Devil*, but only some *Disquietudes*, wherein they might be relieved by the *Prayers* of the *Living*, according to the Opinion of *S. Justin Martyr*. It is certain, that, even in these separate *Receptacles*, these purer Souls are said to be happy, and to be with *Christ*, notwithstanding this *Slavery* to the *Devil*, whilst they are in these *Regions* of *Mortality*; and therefore that their *Slavery* cannot make them liable to such *Inconveniences*, as may be inconsistent with their *Happiness*; nor, that their *Disquietudes* can

be so great, as to hinder their State from being a State of *Rest*, as to the *main*, as the *Scripture* describes it. But how is it reconcilable, that they can be in *Heaven*, as being with *Christ*; and yet in *Adms*, as being altogether free from the *Power* of the *Devil*? Very well: There is the uppermost and the nethermost *Hell* or *Gebenna*. And there is the *Heaven*, and the *Heaven* of *Heavens*, or far above all *Heavens*, in the Language of the *Scripture*, the *Pleroma*, in the Language of the *Gnosticks*. Both *Heavens* are places of *Happiness*, as both *Heavens* are supposed to be in the *Power* of the *Devil*. The *Difference* is this: The lower *Heaven* is the place of the less perfect *Happiness*, as the uppermost *Hell* is the place where the *Devil's* *Power* is most restrained, as it must be where it cannot hinder the *Inhabitants* from being happy. And both these *Qualifications* may agree to the *Air* in the *Bounds* now described, as it is a mixture of *mystical Light* and *Darkness*, answerable to those *Vicissitudes* of *visible Light* and *Darkness* here supposed. As all the *space* between the *Air* and the *Earth* is the *Seat* of *Mortality*, and not properly *Heaven*; so it is contained under the *Kingdom* of *Death*, and of him that has the *Power* of *Death*, as being all *Air*, in *Opposition* to *Heaven*, properly so called. But as it is all *Light*, and, in the places nearest *Heaven*

more pure and *unmixt*, comparatively with what is more *remote* from *Heaven*, and (for that Reason) more *mixt* with *Darkness*; so it has the Name of *Æther*, as contradistinguished from *Air* in a more restrained Sense, and is accordingly capable of that *Happiness* ascribed to it in the *Scripture*. This Distinction is owned by the *Scholast* on *Homer*, who bears the Name of *Didymus*. He makes *three* Spaces of the *Heavenly* Regions: one of the *Air*, μέχρι In Homer II. Θv. 16. φελῶν, εἶτα αἰθέρα μέχρι τῶν φαινόμενων, that is, the *starry Heaven*, so called by *Ara* in his *φαινόμενα*. The *third* therefore is that of the several *Orbs* of the *starry Heaven* itself. Which therefore was, very probably, the *third Heaven*, into which *S. Paul* was caught, of greater Dignity than the *ordinary Heaven* of the *Blessed*, in which they are supposed to be at *present*. This *second Region* therefore seems to be the place of *happy Souls*, till the *Resurrection*. This *S. John* places ὑποκάτω τῆς θυσιαστηρίου, which he Rev. vi. 9. allots even to the *Martyrs* themselves, the *highest Rank* of the *ordinary Blessed*. That *Altar* he calls the *Golden Altar* before the *Throne of God*, *Rev. viii. 3. ix. 3.* No doubt, an Allusion to the *Golden Altar* of *Incense*, which was in that part of the *Jewish Temple*, which was accessible to *none* but the *Priests*. Accordingly the *Oblations* offered on it, are θυμιάματα, *Rev. v. 8.* and *Frankincense*,

incense, Rev. viii. 3, 4. Plainly relating to the *Archetypal Altar*, and the *Archetypal Oblations* offered by the *Archetypal High-Priest* himself in *Heaven*. And *Heaven* is the place which *God* himself, in the *Prophecy* calls his *Throne*, Is. lxvi. 1. And so does our *Saviour*, S. *Matth.* v. 34. xxiii. 22. Who can doubt but that this *Altar before the Throne of God*, can be no other but that *Archetypal Altar in Heaven*, properly so called? The *Martyrs* therefore, which are *under that Altar*, cannot be thought to be in *Heaven* it self. The *Passage* in the *Revelations* it self, supposes them otherwise. They are warned, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled, Rev. vi. 11. This ἀνάπαυσις is plainly that which is ascribed to the *Righteous departed Souls* by Is. liii. 2. and which is alluded to in *Ebr.* ix. 18. and which is *Heaven*, the *Mystical Canaan*, in Allusion to that of the *Israelites* in the *Earthly Canaan*, into which they were introduced by *Joshua*, the Type of our *Jesus*, *Ebr.* iv. 8, 9. And when this *Rest* is mentioned as likely to last but for a little season, till all their *Fellow Martyrs* should have suffered also. That must be till the day of *Judgment*, and seems plainly to allude to that *Accession of Happiness*, which they might then expect, as *Primate Usher* has

has observed from several Passages of the Scripture, as well as of Ecclesiastical Offices relating to it. Yet he was not aware of that easie account of it, by their Translation from this *Subcælestial Region* into *Heaven*, properly so called. The *Rabbins* also seem agreed in the same Notion, when they make the *Residence* of happy Souls under the *Throne of Glory*. Nor do I know any more likely *Original* of this Opinion among them, than this place of *S. John*. That *Situation* under the *Altar*, which is before the *Throne*, will very naturally make it under the *Throne*. And I know no Footsteps of this form of speaking in *Philo*, or *Josephus*, or any other Author of their Nation of unquestionable Antiquity, and near the *Apostles* Age. Yet *Philo* owns the *Golden Altar of Incense* the more holy of the two, as I have shewn in my Discourse against *Occasional Communion*. And the *Archetypes* of that, as well as of all other *Utensils* of the *Temple*, he places in *Heaven* as *S. Paul* does, and as the *Platonists* did all sorts of their *Idea*, which *Word* he also uses in speaking of these Matters. The place therefore of the most happy Souls, till the Day of Judgment, must be the middle place now mentioned from the pretended *Didymus*. So the lowermost of those three Partitions will remain for the less perfectly good Souls, that may need any expiatory Pains for fitting

Cl. Win-
det. de Vit.
funct. stat.
c. 7.

ting them for the *superior Regions*. And the *inflictors* of those *Pains* upon them, may be either those *Devils* who are allowed a *Power* in *this Region* with *less Restraint*, than in the *higher* now mentioned, the *αἰσες δαίμονες* mentioned by *Plato*, the *evil Angels* in the *Psalmist*, as *Instruments of Punishment*; or, perhaps the *Angel of Repentance* mentioned in *Hermas*, as a *good Angel*, and as designing all his *Chastisements* for the *Good* of those who are committed to his *Care*; but rather the *Devils* who were the *Executioners* of *Ecclesiastica Censures*, on those who deserved them, even in *this Life*. Yet under the *Restraint* of such *good Beings* as the *Angels of Repentance*, when those *Chastisements* were inflicted on those who retained *amendable Habits of Vices* contracted in *this Life*. These things may, at least, give a probable *Account* of the *Sense* of the *Antients* in this *Matter*. But for the *middle Region*, of which I was speaking, we see the *Scholias* now mentioned, calls it *Æther*, in *Contradistinction* to *Air*, which is enough to qualify it for the *Residence* of *Spirits*, and the fairest *Candidates* for *Immortality*. For this is the *Philosophical Term* for that *quinta essentia* (as the *Peripateticks* call'd it) that constituted *Cœlestial Bodies*. This will proportionably entitle this *upper sublunary Region* of *Air* as *Æther* to the Name of *Hea-*

ven,

and the *Inhabitants* of it to *Immortality*, as it entitles them to the *true Heaven*, as already *Spiritual*, and already partaking of this *Æther*. So the *Pythagoreans*.

Ἦν δ' ἀπολείψας σῶμα ἐς αἰθερ' ἐλεύθερον
ἔλθης.

Ἔσται ἀθάνατος. θεὸς ἄμβροτος, ἐκ ἐπι-
θνήλος.

The *Æther* is said to be ἐλεύθερος as *free* from the *Slavery* of the *Dæmon* ὕλης, whom the *Scripture* calls the *Devil*. And the Ἀθά-
νατοι θεοί, in those *Golden Verses*, are the *Inhabitants* of the *Æther*, as the Ἡρώες are the *Inhabitants* of the *Air* properly so called, as bounded by the *Earth* below; and the κατὰχθόνιοι δαίμονες are the *Manes* from the surface of the *Earth* downwards. This is the καθεδρὸν φῶς desired by *Ignatius* in the *Epistle* to the *Romans*, as a place proper for *Martyrs*, as being above those *Clouds* which intercept the *Sun's Light*, and darken the *World*, and are *Symbols* of the like *Mythical Darknes*s to the *Inhabitants* of it. Therefore the *Author* of *Philopatris*, calls the *Christians* αἰθερίαις and αἰθεροβατῆντας and ἀεροβατῆντας. The last is the word used by *Aristophanes* in his *Νεφέλαι*, where he ridicules *Socrates*. From whom that *Author* takes the *Fancy* of the *measure* of the *heap* of a *Flea*, which *Aristophanes* makes calcu-

calculated by *Socrates* also. This Author takes occasion thence to expose the *Christian* hopes of *Immortal Happiness* on account of their pretences to this *Ætherial Region*, on pretence of their having the *Spirit*, by turning the Scoff of *Aristophanes* upon them. But he adds the mention of their αἰθερῶσια, in order to the making them more ridiculous than *Socrates*, who contented himself with the *Air*, a Region below the *Christians*. Whilst therefore these *Holy Souls* are in this *Æther*, they are said to be with the Lord, not only as they are one Body and one Spirit with him. For so they are in this World also, and are reckon'd as in him also, as well as he and the Father are said to be in them. The Λόγος is by the *Platonists*, as well as the *Christians*, made the Governour of this World. And, as such, his proper Residence should be in this World. And no where more peculiarly than in that most excellent supreme Region of it. Withal, it is the Privilege of the Peculium to be immediately under the Government of the Λόγος, and to be so far exempt from those subordinate Governours, (to whom that same supreme Governour has permitted other Societies) as they have qualified themselves, for receiving the Benefits of this Government, by their Purity in Flesh and Spirit. And, whatever was the Case of *Samuel* and the old Patriarchs,

as to the particular of the Devil's power over them in the *state of Separation*; yet there is reason to believe that *their Case* is *better* under the Gospel. The *Platonists* themselves believe that, in the *Iron Age*, towards the *end* of the *Annus Magnus*, after the *desertion* of the *Gods*, of whom the *last* was *Astræa*, the *Government* of the *World* was impair'd, and permitted to *Υλν* and *Αν'γνν*, and therefore more liable to the interposition of *Evil Spirits*. But, withal they held that, upon the *beginning* of a *new Revolution*, on the *return* of *Astræa* and the other *Gods*, and the *nova progenies de cælo*, the *new Creature*; the *Δογμ* undertook the *Helm*, the *πνδάλιον*, as *Plato* calls it, and that then the *Golden Age* of *Saturn* was to *return*, which was to put an end to the *mischiefs* of the former *Misgovernment*. So *Hesiod*, and *Virgil* in his famous *Eclogue*. He there makes the *Boy*, upon whose *Birth* the *Golden Age* was to *commence* (which *Constantine the Great* interprets *Mystically* of our *Saviour*) to put an end to all the *mischiefs* then prevailing.

Orat. ad 1
Sanct. cat.
ap. Euseb.
c. 19. III.

*Te duce, si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostri,
Irrita perpetuâ solvent formidine terras.*

Particularly he has these words: *Occidet & Serpens*. Which the same great *Emperour* interprets of the *Devil*, so well known by the name of the *Serpent*, who seduced our first *Parents* in the *Scripture*. And very
pro-

probably the *Poet* might design a *Mystical* meaning by it, when he reckons it among the Privileges of the *Golden Age*. Though his most obvious *literal* Sense may relate to *Python* killed by *Apollo*, whom he afterwards mentions as *King* in the *time* he speaks of: *Tuus jam regnat Apollo*. But the *New Testament* also is very particular in signifying a *diminution* of the *Devil's Power* upon the appearance of our Saviour. Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the Prince of this world be cast out, S. *Job*. xii. 31. The Prince of this world is judged, xvi. 11. Elsewhere the place also is mentioned from whence he is to be cast: I beheld Satan as lightning fall from Heaven, S. *Luke* x. 18. which is yet more plainly described in the *Revelations*. in the visionary Dramatical stile of Prophecy. There a *War* is represented between *Michael* and his *Angels*, and the *Dragon* and his *Angels*. The event of which was that *Expulsion* of the *Devil* out of *Heaven* now mentioned. So it follows: Neither was there place found any more in Heaven. And the great Dragon was cast out, that old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the Earth, and his Angels were cast out with him, *Rev*. xii. 8, 9. After this follows the *Epinicion* upon this *Victory*, which concludes thus: Therefore rejoyce, ye Heavens, and ye that dwell

in them. *Wo to the Inhabitants of the Earth, and of the Sea: for the Devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time, v. 12.* Hence it appears plainly that this *Expulsion* cannot be meant of the *Extinction* of the Devil's Power at the day of *Judgment*, because then there will be no *Inhabitants* of the Earth that can suffer by him. And the *Congratulations* made to the *Heavens* upon this *Victory*, and to their *Inhabitants*, prove that those *Inhabitants* were they who were principally concerned in the *Fruits* of this *Victory*. Which could not be, unless they had been *Sufferers* by him whilst he was *conversant* among them. And an instance is given wherein they were *Sufferers* by his neighbourhood, that he was continually provoking God against them by his *Accusations*. The *Accuser* of our Brethren is cast down, which accused them before God, day and night, v. 10. This advantage he had by his residence there, that he appeared in the *Assemblies* of the good *Angels*, as appears in the Book of *Job*, and the History of the seduction of *Ahab's Prophets* by the lying Spirit. These opportunities he must lose of doing mischief, when he was no longer allowed liberty of appearing among them. And so the Reason of those *Prayers* for the Dead, to preserve them in the state of *Separation*, from those insults of ill Spirits, must

The Distinction between

must also *cease* when the *Devils* were now no longer allowed access to them. I know not whether S. *Justin* do not intimate it when he makes the *Prayers* for them in his time, to be ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ, as if, *after* their *decease*, when they were *lodged* in their *Aetherial* Stations, they did not then so much need the *Prayers* which were made in their *behalf*; but only while the contest was, whether of the *two* sorts of *Spirits* were to be their *Conductors*. But their *Translation* from this *lower* to the *superiour* *Heaven*, seems to be reserved for the day of *Judgment*. Then *Death* is to be *swallowed up in Victory*, and to be *cast into the bottomless pit*, and *Adms* too. - That I take to be, that when the *separate State* should end (as it must do when the *Soul* and *Body* shall be *joyned* together again, and that *eternally*) then the places of *separate Bodies* and *separate Souls* should likewise have an end also. But this *Victory* over *Death*, being the *last*, and therefore immediately preceding the *Triumph* of our *Saviour*, must therefore be at the σωτήρεια, the *Consummation* of all our *Saviour's* *Mediatorial* Office, as well as of the *World*. Perhaps our *Saviour* intimated this in his saying, *it is finished* immediately before his own *Death*, because his *own Death* was to be a *means* for *evacuating ours*. Then it is to be *cast into the Abyss*, the *Tzalmuth*, the *shadow of Death*.

Death; as *Death* made the departed Souls
 umbras or *Shades*, and into the *Land of For-*
getfulness, as if it had never been. Thus
 our Lord fulfilled that *Prophecy* of his own.
O Death, I will be thy Death: O Grave, I
will be thy Destruction, by taking away the
 places of separate Souls and Bodies, when
 the State of Separation it self should be at an
 end. That is, by translating them from the
 district of the βασιλεία θανάτου and φθορᾶς, in-
 to the true Heaven, the proper Region of
 Immortality. Then he is to surrender his
 Government to the Father, and to be him-
 self subject to the Father, when he has
 brought all the Souls which he has pur-
 chased, and surrendered them to his Fa-
 ther. For he owns the original Property of
 them to be in his Father: *Thine they were,*
and thou gavest me them, S. *John* xvii. 6. His
 Office therefore is the προαγωγή, the bring-
 ing them to the Father, answerable to the
 προσήλυσις on our parts, our coming to the
 Father, to bring many Sons unto Salvation;
 that is, the Salvation ἐξ ὑλῆς, out of this
 present World, in the Language of the Scrip-
 ture: that is, out of this sublunary World
 (the Government of which had been commit-
 ted to him by his Father) by translating us
 into Heaven, properly so called, which is
 the peculiar Residence of the Father; for
 when all things were subjected to him, it is
 manifest that he must be excepted, who had
 subjected

subjected them, as the *Apostle* reasons. That is, that the *Father* himself cannot be included in the account of the things subjected to the *Son*: The *Father* still retains that original superiority that is implied in the Name of *Father*, as being the original *Head* of all this mystical Union. He is the same way the *Head* of *Christ Mystical*, that is, of all *Christ's Mystical Body*, and of himself, as deriving the Name of *Son* from that *Spiritual Seed*, which had by himself been received from the *Father*, and which had by him been communicated to all his *Mystical Body* making them thereby his *Brethren*, not his *Sons*; as *Christ* himself is the *Head* of the *Man*, and the *Man* also is the *Head* of the *Woman*, from whence the *Woman's Duty* of *Subjection* is likewise inferred. So this *Subjection* principally relates to this *Filiation* of the *Son*, as he has the fulness of the *Spirit*, not as he is the *Logos*; which will perfectly overthrow all the *Reasonings* of the *Arians*, as well as of our modern *Socinians*. By the *Roman Laws*, a *Son* and *Heir* in *Univocal Generation* (and therefore equal with the *Father* in their common Nature) yet compared with the *Father*, differs very little from a *Servant*, as the *Apostle* reasons, either in *Subjection* or *Property*, whilst the *Father* lives; which must hold eternally, where the *Generation* is *Eternal* and the *Father* is supposed to live for ever.

And even the *Catholick Fathers* own a *Subordination* of the *Son* to the *Father*, as not derogatory to their *Consubstantiality*, and take it to be the Sense of his own Words: *My Father is greater than I*: and this in regard of the *Λόγος* it self. Thus therefore the *Son*, when he has *finished* all the *Concerns* of the *Province* committed to him by his *Father*, and *translated* all his *Subjects* into *Heaven*, the *District* of his *Father* must then be *subject* to him, as a *Prince*, returned from his *Province*, is, when he returns from it into the *peculiar Jurisdiction* of his *Father*. And to shew that the Case is indeed so, it is very observable, that, when the *Scripture* describes our *Blessed Lord's coming to Judgment*, it mentions no other *Attendants* but his *Holy Angels*; no *Patriarchs*, no *Prophets*, no *Apostles*, no, nor any *Martyrs*, nor any other *Order* whatsoever of *created Souls*. We are, on the contrary, said to *meet him in the Air*. Not only as our then raised *Bodies* are to be lifted from their *Graves* in *Earth*, but as they are in the *Air*, the *Adms* of *Souls*, to meet those *Souls* which are to be *united* to them. Then our *Bodies* also will by him be made *Pneumatical*, when they are *fashioned like his glorious Body*, and fitted for the *Wings* of the *Spirit*, which will then *translate* them to the *highest Heavens*, the *Regions* of *Immortal Happiness* by the *Reasonings*

T

ings of the *Apostle*, in the *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*.

56. This is the *Divine Spirit*, by which all the *Mystical Union* and *Communion* is maintained. They who partake of it are said to have the *ἑνωστικὴν πνεύματι*, and to be one Spirit with each other. Yet so as to oblige them to *Unite* in the *Principle* from whence they receive it, as in a common *Head*, as *Brethren* in the *Patriarchal Bodies* were obliged to depend on their eldest *Brother* as the *Successor* of their common *Father*, as to all those *Rights* which the interests of *Societies* made *Indivisible*. Thus *God* created man in his own likeness, male and female created he them, and called their name *Adam*, *Gen. v. 1, 2*. Here the *Spirit* seems to be meant by the likeness of *God*, which elsewhere is ascribed to *Adam* alone, but here to his *Wife* as well as him, as being given *Her* by *Consequence*, as being One with *Him*, and with this very *Design* of making her One with him. So *Malachi* urges it as an *Argument* for the *Unanimity* of *Conjugal* *Consorts*: *The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth against whom thou hast dealt treacherously. Yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy Covenant. And did not he make one? Ye had but the residue of the Spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly Seed* *Malach. ii. 14*. Here the *Matrimonial Union*

This Spirit is the Principle of Mystical Unity, as obliging all that receive it, to depend on him from whom they all originally received it. What is meant by *ἑνωστικὴν*, or having Life in himself.

is attributed to the *Spirit* given to both
 Consorts, to *sanctifie* them in order to the
 producing a *holy Seed*, and to the making
 them *One*. Alluding plainly to that *like-
 ness* to *God*, which is in *Genesis* ascribed to
 that *Adam*, who is there said to have been
Female as well as *Male*; not to *Eve* at all,
 though to her also as *one* with him, and
 indeed in order to the making her *one Spi-
 rit* with him, as the *Matrimonial Contract*
 had made them *one Body*. Yet so, the *Spi-
 rit* being given *immediately* to *Adam*, and
 to *Eve* no otherwise than as *one* with him;
 this made *Adam* the *Head* of this *Union*,
 and obliged the *Woman* to a *Dependence* on
 the *Man* for this *participation* of the *Spirit*
 derived from him, in order to the Procrea-
 tion of a *holy Seed*. When therefore the
unbelieving Husband was sanctified by the
believing Wife; it seems principally inten-
 ded for a *Convert Wife*, who had been
 married when *both* were *Infidels*. But, if,
 after a *Divorce*, or a *Decease* of a *Husband*
 of the *Peculium*, her *Children* by an *Infidel*
 were counted of the *holy Seed*; this must
 have been rather on account of *Favour* to
 the *Children* than any *Reason* or *Merit* de-
 rivable from such a *Parent*. And so it self,
 on account of the *Holiness* received for-
 merly. Thus the *Man* is called the *Head*
 of the *Woman*, 1 *Cor.* xi. 3. *Eph.* v. 23. Not
 on a *Civil* account only, but a *Religious*

and *Mystical* one. I mean, in *Marriages* contracted in the *Peculium*. Thence the concern of *Christian Ministers* in *Christian Marriages*, even from the time of the *Apostles* themselves, as appears from *Ignatius*. The *Man* is said to be the *Head* of the *Woman*, as *Christ* is the *Head* of the *Man*, and as *God* is of *Christ*, 1 *Cor.* xi. 3. And as *Christ* is called the *Head* of his *Church* as her *Mystical Bridegroom*; and as he is the *Head* of all *Principality and Power*, *Col.* ii. 1. *Angels and Authorities and Powers being made subject unto him*, 1 *S. Pet.* iii. 22. And all on the same account of this *Divine Spirit*, and the *Original* from whence it is derived. The *Man* is the *Head* of the *Matrimonial Union*, because the *Woman* receives the *Residue* of that *Spirit* which is given to the *Man*. So is *Christ* the *Head* of *Man*, because even *he* can pretend no otherwise to this same *Spirit*, than as *he* is *Baptized* into that *Body*, with which *Christ* also is pleased to contract a *Mystical Marriage*; and thereby to communicate, out of his own *Fulness* of the *Spirit*, those particular *Gifts and Graces* of that same *Spirit*, as the *Nuptial Arrba*, and *Donum antenuptiale* of this most Sacred *Conjugal Bond*, which are requisite both for the *Safety* of their *Souls*, and for discharging their *Duties* in their respective stations in the *Body Politick* of the *Church*. So also is the *Head*

of the *Cœlestial* Orders of *Angels*, because they must receive those *Spirits*, which make them *πνεύματα λειτουργικά*, from the same *Fulness* of the *Spirit* which *dwells* in him. In this regard the *Heavenly* state to which our *Lord* has exalted us, by giving us this *Spirit*, is an *ἰσαγγελία*. They are called *Sons of God* in the Book of *Job* and elsewhere. Which makes us their *Brethren*, as partaking of the same *immortal Seed* of the *Spirit* of the *Father*. And our *Lord* is justly called the *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, as the *Original* and *Head* of all the *καινὴ κτίσις*, the new Colonies of *Spirits*, without being any *κτίσις* himself, but as possessing the *Fulness* of that *Seed* of the *Father*, which gives *Creatures* the honour of a *Cœlestial* and *Divine* Extraction, by being joyned with them, not by being it self created, but by being sent to inhabit them as *κῆποι* or *Coloni* were in a new founded *City*, who did not begin their *Being* when they began their *Habitation*. This Notion of *κτίσις* neither the *Arians* of old, nor our modern *Socinians* were aware of, that I know of. The first *Habitation* therefore of this *Spirit* was in the *Human Nature* of *Christ*, which yet was it self as *Eternal* as his own *Λόγος*, by which the *World* it self was created. Thus also *God the Father* was the *Head* of *Christ*, as being the first *Original* of the same *Spirit*, and from whom

whom *Christ* himself received it. But in another way from that by which the *Angels* and *we* receive it from *Christ*. It proceeds from the *Father* as the *Seed* of the *Father*, and under that Notion is derived to the *Man Christ*, so as to make him also the *Son* of the *Father*. Yet so as to reserve to him all the *Rights* of an *Eldest Son*, because it is not derived to any others but by him. Not even to the *Angels* but by him as *AdyC*, not unto *Man* but by him as the *Original* by which it is derived to *other Men*, which seems to be the Reason, why even the *Post-diluvian Patriarchs* at least, could not receive it till his *Glorification*. Because till then the *Spirit* could not be expected, as the *Apostle* himself expressly testifies, *S. John* vii. 39. Then we have the first Experiment of it in the *Bodies* of the *Saints*, which then rose out of their *Monuments*, and appeared to many in the *Holy City*, *S. Math.* xxvii. 52, 53. Nor was it fit that it should have been sooner, because it was the *Man Christ*, to whom this *Fulness* of the *Spirit* was given, from which all his *Members* were to receive their *shares* respectively. That seems to be his plain meaning in those words: *As the Father hath Life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself: and hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man*, *S. John* v. 26, 27. The derivative

ἐν αὐτῷ. ζωοποιεῖν entitles him only to the quickening from whom it is derived, and therefore does not put it in the Power of them who receive it to quicken themselves. That is only in the Power of them who possess it Originally. In them it is the αὐτοζωή, as the Scripture supposes it to be in the Father in regard of the Son, and in the Son in relation to us. This is the meaning of the Platonick term αὐτοζωή, and therefore imports that it is in the Sons Power to raise his own Body, to lay down his Life, and to take it up again, which is here ascribed to the Man Christ, if the latter part of this Sentence have any connexion with the former. Thus, therefore the Resurrection of our Lord's Body is sometimes ascribed to his Father, sometimes to himself. Very consequently, because the Spirit by which the Son is said to have Life in himself, in relation to the raising his own Body, is notwithstanding it self the Gift of the Father.

Thus the Spirit is represented as a Bond of Unity, even in the Originals of the most Sacred Mystical Unity. The Son himself, as Man, can lay no claim to the Spirit, but in Conjunction with the Father, from whom he is immediately to receive it, as from the first Principle of the Spirit. Nor can the Soul of Man receive it, but

57.

Thus therefore all Members of Churches were obliged to depend on their respective Governours, in order to the receiving of the Spirit.

by its *Conjunction* with the Son, from whom all, who will entitle themselves to it by the Rules of the new *Peculium*, must immediately receive it. Thus all *ἡγεμονία* with the Father depends on the Son. The Father himself dwells in the Light in accessible, 1 Tim. vi. 16. 1 S. Job. iv. 12. Therefore no man hath seen him at any time : The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him, S. Job. i. 18. Therefore God shines in our hearts in the face of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. iv. 6. As being the Image of the invisible God, Col. i. 15. *Ἐκὼν* is the word. As we content ourselves to see the Image of the Sun reflected in the Water, when we are not able to behold him with our naked Eye. By him therefore it is, as I have said, that we have *μετοικονομία*, as that answers the *Profelytism* of the new *Peculium*, without which we cannot be made *Citizens* of the *Mystical Cœlestial Jerusalem*. So clear it is, that, by this *Headship* of the Father to Christ it is implied, that none can partake of the *Mystical ἡγεμονία* with the Father but by the Son, any more than any distant Members can partake of the influences of the Head, which do not receive them by *Communication* with those intermediate Members through which they are to be derived. The same also is the Case of Christ himself as the Head, in relation to

the

the Spirit; whoever has not the Spirit of Christ is none of his, Rom. viii. 9. As not holding the head, from which all the Body, by joynts and bands, having nourishment, mistred and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God, Col. ii. 19. Where we see this same Reasoning allowed in the Mystical Body, which none can doubt of in the natural Organical Body. No doubt, to let us understand that God intends to deal with us accordingly. And so indeed God has contrived the matter, even among Men, that, though all derive the Spirit from the Son, yet all should not have it from him immediately; but that all should receive it from some one Principal Person who was designed by God as the Principal of their Unity, upon whom he intended they should depend, if they would entitle themselves to the same Spirit. So the Spirit of Moses was to be derived to the LXX Elders, Numb. xi. 17, 25. So Elisha inherited a double portion of the Spirit of Elijah. According to the right of an Elder Brother, by the Law, who was to have twice as much as any of his Brethren of their common Inheritance. So S. John urges his own Communion as the means by which all were to expect Communion with the Father and the Son, 1 S. John i. 3. Implying, on the contrary, that they who did not so entitle themselves could lay no claim to the Mystical Communion with the Father and

The Distinction between

and the Son. And that is indeed supposed in all the *Reasoning* of his *first Epistle*, which plainly supposes all, who were out of that *Communion*, to be in *darkness, death and error*, the *contraries* to the *benefits* of the *true Communion*, of *Light and Life and Truth*. He speaks there not only in the name of the *Apostolical College* then joyned to him in *Ephesus*, as when he speaks in the plural number; but also in his own, as the *Visible Head* of that *Mystical Union and Communion*, as the *rightful Head* even of those *Apostles*. The same was afterwards the Case of all *Bishops* who succeeded the *Apostles*, or rather the *Head Apostle* in this very *Prerogative* of being *Heads of Catholick Unity*, of being the only *Authorized Representatives* of the *Original Mystical Heads* of it, the *Father and the Son*, both as to the *Admission* to this *Union* of the *Spirit*, and *Exclusion* from it, with a *Right* to oblige the *Father and the Son* to ratify their *Acts* in *Heaven*, as I have shewn in my *Paranesis*. Then every *Church* succeeded the *Church of Jerusalem* in that *supreme unappealable Power* of obliging *God and Christ* immediately to receive those to the *Heavenly Communion* who were received by them, and to exclude those from *Heaven* whom they should judge worthy to be so excluded, by the *Doctrine* of the *Catholick Church* in the *first and purest Ages* of *Ignatius and S. Cyprian*. Then every

every *Bishop* had the *same* Power of acting either way in the affairs of his *own Church*, as the *Head Apostle* had, not only for the *District of Jerusalem*, but also for the *whole Church diffusive*, as being then *subject* to the *District of Jerusalem*, as I have endeavoured to prove in my Discourse concerning *One Priesthood* and *One Altar*. The whole Reasoning of the *Scriptures* supposes the same *Dependence* in the Society of the *Church* in relation to the *Spirit*, as there is between the Members of the *Organical Body*, in order to the Communication of *Vital* or *Animal Influences*.

The *Apostle* supposes the like Variety of 58.
Offices in the *Polity* of the *Church*, as there is *The Spirit*
 in the *Members* of the *Human Body*. He sup- *was not, in*
 poses the same Variety of *Gifts* and *Graces* *the earli-*
 of the *Spirit*, requisite for the *discharging* *est Ages,*
 of these *Offices* in the *Church*, as of *natural* *thought de-*
Powers and *Influences* for performing the *rivable to*
Functions of the several *Members* of the *Animal* *any Mem-*
Body. He makes the same mutual *bers of the*
 needs of each others assistance between the *Churches,*
Political as between the *Animal* *but from*
Members. *the Heads*
 So that even the *noblest* *Members* of the *of those*
Spiritual Society need the *Gifts* of the *Churches.*
inferiour *Members*, as well as the *Inferiours*
 need the more *honourable* *Talents* of their
Spiritual Superiours. Among these *Mem-*
 bers of the *Visible Body* he owns a *Spiritual*
Head, as well as *Feet*, or *Hands*, or *Eyes*,
 on

The Distinction between

on which the *rest* of the *Members* of the *Political Spiritual Society* must (by the *Tenor* of this *Reasoning*) depend as much for deriving *Spiritual Influences* as the *Animal Members* depend on the *Head* for their *Vital Influences*. This being supposed, it will be as *impossible* for any *Member* of the *Spiritual Body* to have the *Spirit*, when separated from the *Head*, as it is for any *Animal Member* to retain any remainder of *Animal Life*, when separated from the *Animal Head*. So it must be if this *Unity* of the *Spirit* be purposely designed by *God* for confederating a *Political Body* under a *Monarchical Head*. They must necessarily lose the *Spirit*, who divide themselves from the *Head* of the *Body* from which alone it can be expected. And *God* has contrived the *Fact* so, that it can be expected from none besides. *God* alone conveyed the *Spirit* to the *Son*. The *Son* alone gave it to the *Apostles*, first preparatively, by breathing; then by giving the *Gifts* themselves with the *Evidences* and *Proofs* that they were really given, to the satisfaction of those who saw them in the day of *Pentecost*. And the *Apostolical* degree is reckoned as the first of all these *Extraordinary Offices*: first, *Apostles*, secondly *Prophets*, &c. As the *Standard*, of all other, even *Extraordinary Officers*, who were not otherwise to be believed to have this *Divine Spirit*.

rit, if they pretended to any *Revelations* different from those of the *Apostles*; or to receive it by any *Ministry* besides. The *Spirit* was given to *Cornelius* at the preaching of *S. Peter*, though *without* the *Imposition* of his *Hands*, in that singular *Extraordinary* instance, by which the *Apostle* himself was to be convinced that *God* did not look on *Cornelius* as *unclean*, because he was not *circumcised*. Thence forward the *Ordinary* way of receiving the *Spirit* was only from the *Apostles*, and not otherwise to be received from them than by *Imposition* of their *Hands*. Then whosoever had not so received the *Spirit* could not be presumed to have it at all. Thus the *Unity* of the *Spirit* united all that pretended to it to the *College* of the *Apostles* in general, and in them to *Christ* their *Head*, as being themselves the *Twelve Foundations* on *Christ* himself, as the *chief corner Stone*. For this I have shewn to be the truly *Catholick* Archetypal Church, from Union with which all particular Churches must derive their stile of *Catholick*, if they will justly pretend to it. But after their *decease*, none but the *Bishops* succeeded the *Apostles* in that high Prerogative of giving the *Spirit* by the *Imposition* of their *Hands*. Therefore *Cornelius* argues, that *Novatian*, being *Baptized* a *Clinick*, and wanting the *σφραγίς* of the *Bishop*, he could not have the *Spirit*.

Parænes.

Ep. ad Fab.

Ant. ap.

Euf. H.E.

Tert. vi. 43.

The Distinction between

Τὸτε μὴ τυχόν, ὡς ἂν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἔτι πῶς; The Spirit is that by which we are sealed after we believed, Eph. i. 13. That is, on the Profession of our Faith required in Baptism. And sealed to the day of Redemption, Eph. iv. 30. The Seal is that by which the εἰκὼν is impressed, that is, of the Second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, the Spirit, in the Reasoning of S. Paul, which is given in our Saviour's Baptism. And the notion of Sealing alludes to the Distinction God is pleased to make between his own Favourites and others, in times of Publick Epidemical Calamities. It is called Sealing them in their Foreheads, in Ezekiel and the Revelations. By which Sealing, as by a Mark, God is said to know those who are his, as by a Seal, 2 Tim. ii. 19. So the Spirit is the Mark by which we have a Title to have our bodies Immortaliz'd at the Resurrection, which is the Redemption, Rom. viii. 23. S. Luke xxi. 28. This therefore was then given by the Bishops only, as the Successors of the Apostles, as the Spirit was given by none but the Apostles, whilst they lived. So the Bishop of Asia gave the σφραγίς to the young Man recommended to his Care by St. John, in the Story mention'd by Clemens Alexandrinus: And that in his φῶτισμός. Which plainly shews, that the σφραγίς τὸ πνεῦμα, here spoken of, is the same with the baptismal Spirit, that true φῶς from whence

Ἦν ὁ πᾶς
σφ. &
Euf. H. E.
iii. 23.

our

our Saviour's baptism came be entitled to the name of φωτισμός. *Valesius* there shews that the name of σφραγίς is used for the *Baptismal Spirit* in the eldest Monuments of the Church, as I have also shewed it so used in the *Scriptures* themselves. This that Bishop took for the τέλειον φυλακτικόν, which made him remit of his Care afterwards, when he thought him sufficiently fortified against the attempts of the *Evil Spirit*, by his reception of the *Good Spirit*. Which plainly shews, that the *supreme Baptism* was here intended, the *Peculiar* benefit of which was, to give the *Good Spirit* to those who were rightly disposed for it by the previous *Discipline* they were to undergo while they were *Catechumens*, and by the *Baptism of Water* also. Among the *Principles* of the *Doctrine of Christ*, the *Apostle* reckons *Baptisms*, *Ebr. vi. 1, 2.* in the plural Number : meaning the *Baptism of Water*, as *Distinct* from that of the *Spirit*. And they were indeed more distinct in the Practice of that *Age*, than we now are commonly aware of. The *Baptism of Water* was *Purgative* or *Cathartick*, to use the proper term of that *Age* for expressing their *Initiatory Mysteries*, for purifying from the pollution of former *Sins*, and of the *unclean Spirits*, which were then supposed to possess the purest *Moralists* before their reception into the *Christian Society*. This
Bap-

The Distinction between

Baptism was usually administered by *lower Ministers*, even where the *principal* Person was *present*, by whose *Authority* the Ceremony was performed. Our Saviour himself is said to have *Baptized more Disciples than S. John the Baptist*. Yet not in his own Person, but only by his *Disciples*, S. Joh. iv. 1, 2. But he did not give the *Spirit* by them, but at a considerable distance afterwards. Indeed not till after the *Resurrection* at *Pentecost*. Then it was that he *baptized*, even the *Apostles* themselves with the *Holy Ghost* and with *Fire*, that is, with the *Schechinah* of the *fiery cloven Tongues*. So in the Case of *Cornelius*, S. Peter commanded him to be *baptized* with *Water*, after God had *immediately* baptized him and his with the *Holy Ghost*, *Act. x. 48*. It seems the *Baptism* of *Water*, was below the dignity of an *Apostle* to perform in his Person. So S. Philip the Deacon *baptized* the believing *Samaritans*, *Act. viii. 12, 13*. But the *Spirit* was not given them till two *Apostles*, S. Peter and S. John, laid their hands upon them, *v. 15, 16, 17*. So among the many *Corinthians* who pretended to be of *Paul*, the *Apostle* himself assures us, that very few had really been *baptized* by him, though the main occasion of those *Divisions* seems to have been, that *each* of them seems to have denominated himself from the *Preacher* from whom he had received his *Baptism*.

know

know no Expedient so likely for *reconciling* these so seemingly different appearances, as if we should say, that *greater* numbers were *baptized* by his *Authority* in that same Church of *Corinth*, than could pretend the honour to have received their *Water Baptism* from his *Person*, that being a Favour reserved for some *few* of more *eminent* Station, which the Instances now mentioned shew to have been probable, considering the *Sentiments* of that *Age*. Yet it will turn to the same account, if we allow the *greater* number of those *Corinthians*, who gloried in his *Name*, to have received the *higher Baptism* of the *Spirit* by the *Imposition* of his *Hands*, though they had received their *Water Baptism* from some *other* Preacher. This was indeed the *Baptism* that gave *Profelytes* the fairest pretences for *Glorying*. And the *Ministers* of this more *Honourable Baptism* were *themselves* more *honourable*, and therefore more likely to give occasion to *Ostentatious Dividers* to distinguish *Parties* by their *Names*. If this were so, *Apollos* also, the *Head* of those who called themselves from *him*, might have given the *Spirit* also. And it is not improbable but that *second College* of the *Jerusalem Presbyters*, who had *Catholick Jurisdiction*, might have that *Power* so necessary for the first *Foundation* of *Churches*.

59. But whether they had so *then*, or not, there appears no likelihood that the last Bishops were left by the Apostles, or Jerusalem Presbyters, left any but Bishops in possession of that Right of conferring the Baptismal Spirit. That higher Age in possession of this Church, another Symbol, by which the Power of Spirit was signified and conferred, distinct from the Symbol of Water, that of Oil. And they gave it by Unction which none could consecrate besides themselves. And in this regard, it is reckon'd as a distinct Sacrament from the Water Baptism by S. Cyprian, when he would have Profelyted Hereticks and Schismatics, received *utroque Sacramento*. Meaning that way of conveying the Spirit by Imposition of Hands, as well as the Baptism of Water. Yet both of them may be contained under the one common name of Baptism, as it was the Right of our Saviour's Baptism, exceeding all other Baptisms then known of, to convey the Spirit; and as our new Sacramental Regeneration under the Gospel is not only of Water but of the Spirit. Yet we do not find any beginning of this Symbol of Unction in the very early Ecclesiastical Monuments, which mention it. Nor could there have been so great a Consent of the Primitive Churches in using it, if it had descended from any other Original but that of Tradition derived from the Apostles, by the Reasonings of Tertullian, and S. Augustine, and Vincentius Lerinensis. The Spirit

Spirit it self is called *Unction* by *S. John*, which implies it to have been given by that same *Symbol of Unction*, in that very time when *S. John* wrote that *Catholick Epistle*. For he seems to *Reason* therefrom the *Symbol* by which the *Spirit* was given, as *S. Paul* does from the *descent* into the *Water*, and *ascending* out of it, to the duties of *dying* and *ascending* with *Christ* in *Baptism*. And why should our Lord's having the *Fulness* of the *Spirit* be expressed by his being *anointed with the Oyl of Gladness* above his *Fellows*; but because it was the known way of giving the *Spirit* received among the *Jews* to their *Kings*, *Priests* and *Prophets*, to convey it by the *Symbol of Oyl*? So it was in the Case of his *Fellows*, as appears by the eldest *Monuments* next those of the *New Testament*. And it being the same Case before, under the *Old Testament*; it is hard to doubt but it must have been so in the *middle space* in Cases not *Extraordinary*, which were intended as *Precedents* for all *future Ages*. Our *Saviour's* instance was indeed *Extraordinary*, who could not receive the *Spirit* in the *Fulness* of it by any *Humane Ministry*, nor therefore by any *Visible Symbol*, being *Himself* the *Original* from whom all others, not *Men* only, but *Angels* also, were to receive it. So also was the Case of *Cornelius*, when the *Apostles themselves*, who

were the *Ordinary Ministers* for giving the *Spirit*, were to be *instructed* that *God* did not look on his *Uncircumcision* as any *obstacle* against his *receiving* it, which they had not *known*, but by that *Extraordinary* way of *God's* giving the *Spirit* to *Corneilius* immediately, *without* their *Ministry*. Withal, we have exprefs Testimonies in the *New Testament* it self for giving the *Grace of Healing* by this very *Symbol* of *Oyl*, in the *Gospel* of *S. Mark*, and the *Epistle* of *S. James*. Why should one *single* Benefit of the *Spirit* be conveyed by the *Symbol* of *Oyl*, and not rather the *Spirit* it self, when it self is called an *Unction*, and the *giving* it to our *Blessed Lord* himself is called an *anointing* him? How can we better judge of the *Practice* of the *Apostles* Age, when the *Scripture History* is silent on both sides, than by so plain Testimonies both *before* and *after* it? In truth, it had been morally impossible for the *Governours* afterwards to have *confined* the *Conveyance* of the *Spirit* to certain *Symbols*, if they had not received them as so *confined* by *Divine Revelations* to the *Apostles*. They could not have *obliged* *God* and *Christ* to ratifie in *Heaven* what they performed on *Earth*, if they had not had *God* and *Christ's* *Authority* for connecting the *Spirit* with the *Symbol* of *Oil*. They could not *then* have *imposed* their own *Sentiments* on *others*, who

who would have thought their own *Rights* invaded by this *Confinement*, if they had introduced the *Confinement* without an *Authority* sufficient to justify it. The *Fact*, whether the *Apostles* had *Authorized* it, required no depth nor sagacity of *Reasoning* then to *discover* it; but was as manifest to the *meanest*, as the *ablest* *Understanding*. And the *nature* of it, being such as that *all* were concerned in it, made it so *notorious* as that it required no admission to *Secrets* to know whether it were so. Every individual *Member* was obliged to entitle himself to the *Spirit*; which yet he could not attain without the *Unction*, after the *Governours* (who were alone believed to have the *Power* of conveying the *Spirit*) had *confined* their *Conveyance* of it to this *External Symbol*. Indeed this way of conveying the *Spirit* by *consecrated Oil*, excluded all *others* from any *Right* of conveying the *Spirit* who had not the *Power* of *Consecrating* the *Oil*, by which it was to be *conveyed*. What *Mutinies* then, what *Animosities*, what *Oppositions* within, what *Scandals* without, must have followed, if any had been *excluded* from *Rights* possessed *before*? And how could they have *prevailed* that had *encroached*, when they had no *Power* to *force* their *Subjects*, but the *Conviction* of their *Subjects Consciences*, concerning their own *Right*; and

The Distinction between

where withal the *Right* it self, where-ever it was, must have been so *notorious* ? How could all the different *Independent Churches* have been so *unanimous* in *owning* this Claim, if it had indeed been an *Encroachment* ? It is not probable that *all* would have *yielded* their *Rights* willingly. Much less is it probable, that all could have been *forced*, by the *Practices* of single *Persons*, to *part* with them *unwillingly*, when there was no other *force* that could be offered to them, but pure Considerations of *Conscience*, granted on the *merit* of the *Cause* it self. This *Force* could not take place but where the *Righteousness* of the *Cause* was very *manifest*. However, when this *Practice* of conveying the *Spirit* by *Unction* prevailed : none could pretend to the *Divine Spirit* who had not *thus* received it. The *Bishops* alone were owned to have the Power of *Consecrating* the *Oil* by which it was to be administered. Thus the *Unction* of the *Spirit* could not be given without the *Bishop's* consent. Whenever the *Presbyters* gave it, they could not do it without the *Oil* consecrated by the *Bishop*. And even so they did it with a *difference* that plainly owned their *dependence* on the *Bishop* in doing it, besides their *use* of his *consecrated Oil*. The *Anointing* on the *Forehead* was reserved to the *Bishop*, as a *Prerogative* of his place.

This

This obliged the Persons so *anointed* to attend the *Bishop* himself afterwards, that he might *ratify* in his own *Person* what had been *before* performed by his Power only *delegated* to the *Presbyters*. And very fitly at that time when the *Baptized Person* also *ratified* in his own *Person* that same *Covenant*, which had before been transacted in his Name by his *Stipulators*. This kept the *whole Church* (the *Presbyters* themselves not excepted) in a perpetual *dependence* on the *Bishops* in order to their partaking of the *Union* of the *Spirit*. And that even in regard of the *highest* and *noblest Baptism*, that of the *Spirit*, without which none can make out his *Title* to any *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*. Perfectly, as the *Reasonings* of *S. Ignatius* and *Tertullian*, suppose in this very Case of *Baptism*. Nor can I find that even this *delegated* Power of *conferring* the *Spirit* by Oil consecrated, *not* by themselves, but the *Bishops*, was ordinarily communicated to *Presbyters*, before the *Fourth Century*. Then first we find it observed, and observed as a *singularity* by *Hilarius Sardus* commonly mistaken for *S. Ambrose*, and the Author of the *Questions* in the *Old and New Testament*, under the name of *S. Augustine*, that in *Alexandria* and *Aegypt* *Presbyters* did use it when there was no *Bishop* present. *Consecrate* is the word used by the one, as *con-*

signare is by the other. *Consignare* in all likelihood alludes to the *σφραγίς*, the name of the *Baptismal Spirit*, as I have already shewed in the earliest Monuments. For this *Tertullian* uses the word *signare*. So: *Caro ungitur ut anima consecretur, caro signatur ut anima muniatur, manūs impositione adumbratur, ut anima spiritu illuminetur, de Res. carn. c. 8.* So the *Signati in frontibus* in the Rites of *Mithra* are by him compared with the like Practice in our *Christian Baptism*, *de Præscr. c. 40.* And in *S. Cyprian*: *Muniatur frons ut signum Dei incolume servetur, Ep. 58. Pleb. Theb.* And the word *consignare* is thus applyed by him. *Et si fons signatus est* [He speaks of the Church] *neq; bibere inde, neq; consignari potest, cui foris posito accessus ad fontem non est, Ep. 69. Ed. Oxon.* His *signum* also is in *fronte* as before. And again, *Frons cum signo Dei pura Diaboli coronam ferre non potuit, coronæ se Domini reservavit, de Laps. & de Unit. Eccl. & ad Demetrianum. Testimon. adv. Jud. c. 8.* And this is in truth the most proper *Consecration* of our Persons when the Holy Ghost is conferred upon us, which is indeed, the *Principle* of all *Personal Holiness*. This therefore being then observed as a *singularity* in the Church of *Alexandria*, seems plainly to imply, that the generality of the *other Catholick Bishops* had not then so far delegated their Power, as to enable *Presbyters*

byters ordinarily to confer the *Spirit* as their *Proxies*. It was not so in the *West*, when *S. Hierome* wrote against the *Luciferians*, as appears by his Reasonings, what *inconveniences* would follow if they had not the *Baptismal Spirit*, who had not received it from the *Bishops*. He needed not to have been put to that *shift*, if he could have pleaded any general *Ordinary* delegating from the *Bishops* for that purpose, which might have *enabled* them to do it, though exceeding the *Power* of their own *Order*; much less, if he could have proved their own *Order* sufficient for that purpose, *without* any such delegation. Least of all, if he could truly have pretended that this was the *received* Opinion of that *Age*. *Inconveniences alone* that must necessarily befall them who want the means *appointed* by *Christ* for attaining the *Spirit*, cannot discharge any from their *Obligation* to use such *means* if they will pretend to any *Right* to the end for which they were *appointed* by him. I know none in the *West* that *allowed* this *delegated* *Unction* by *Priests* with *Oil* *consecrated* by *Bishops*, till after this time. So clear it is, that the *Right* of conferring the *Spirit* was *Originally* in *Bishops*, and none *but* *Bishops*; and that the *Right* of *Presbyters* to do it was *later*, and no more than what they could derive from the *Concession* of *Bishops* in whom

whom it was Originally. This obliges all, who will pretend to the *Spirit*, to a strict dependence on them; and is alone sufficient, by the Reasonings, even of those best and purest Ages, to oblige all to depend on the Bishops, who desire a solid Title to the Good and Divine *Spirit*. And it will, on the contrary, be a just *Præsumption* against the pretensions to the true *Spirit*, if they violate the *Unity* of the *Spirit*, who pretend to have the *Spirit*. That cannot be a *Good Spirit* which is derived from any but the Bishops, to whose disposal God has, by these Reasonings, confined the *Spirit*. That cannot be a good *Spirit*, which encourages *Divisions*, or which weakens the obligation to *Unity* thus settled by God: which makes the *Graces* of the *Sacraments* easily, and frequently, attainable without the *Sacraments*: which makes them attainable in different and contradictory *Communion*s: which makes them attainable at *Altars* separate, not only from the true *Bishop*, but from *Episcopacy* it self: which allows such *Perfection* in this *Life*, as perfectly to supersede the use of *Sacraments*, to entitle to the *Heavenly Communion* immediately, without any external *Communion* on *Earth*. Such *Spirits* as these cannot possibly be that same *Spirit* which unites all that partake of it in one *Communion*, under one *Bishop* by the firmest Ties of *Spiritual Interest*. They must

must therefore be *wicked Spirits*, and *Spirits of Error*, if it be a *good Spirit* that is derived by the *Ordinances of Christianity*. This is very applicable to the Case of our *Episcopal Brethren in Scotland*, whom you mention as favourable to *Mrs. Bourignon*. Yet the account given by her Admirers of her *Girls* instructed by her, that they proved *Witches*, is a particular ground of just suspicion, that it could be *no good Spirit* which she pretended to. Yet her *fancy* was so possessed with this *Event*, that she pretends it as a *Revelation* from *Christ* himself, that the greatest number of those who profess his Name are in *express Covenants* with the *Devil*. As extravagant was her designed journey to *Jerusalem* in *Man's* Cloaths, when she knew not on what Point of the Compass *Jerusalem* lay. It had no *Event* worthy a *Divine Inspiration*. But it might have had a very *ill one*, if the Providence of the *Good Spirit* had not timely interposed for preventing the ill *Consequences* of that *illusion* of the *Evil* one. How her Executor *Monfieur Poirot* can account for these things I know not ; no more than I can guess, where he has concerned *me* in his *Disputes* concerning her.

Thus, I hope, I have shewn that this 60.
 Doctrine of the *Distinction* of the *Soul* and *A natu-
 rally mor-
 tal Soul is more agreeable to be joyned with a naturally mortal Body,
 as a constituent of Human Nature, than a Soul naturally immortal.*
Spirit

The Distinction between

Spirit (how little soever observed in our modern *Systems*) is neither *Unscriptural* nor *Uncatholick*, but indeed more agreeable to *Scripture* and *Tradition* too, than what is advanced as *inconsistent* with it. I may now add further its greater *use* for solving the greatest *difficulties* in *Religion* now disputed, which yet were no disputes in the *Primitive Church* before the *modern Hypothesis* was thought of. It is most certain that our *Bodies* were at *first* created *Mortal*. There had otherwise been no more *need* nor *use*, of the difference of *Sex* then, than there will be at the *Resurrection*, when *Individuals* will be *immortalized*. The *use* of them is only to preserve the *Species* when the *Individuals* cannot be preserved. Nor had there otherwise been any *use* of the *Tree of Life* to make them *Immortal*, if even their *Bodies* had been *immortal Naturally*. But a *naturally mortal Soul* is more suitable to a *naturally mortal Body*, than a *Soul* that is *naturally Immortal*. Why then should the *Body* have been made *mortal*, even then, if the *Soul* had been *Immortal*? This would have been more easily accounted for, if the *Body* had been no *part* of our *Humane Nature*, but perfectly *præternatural* to the *Soul*, which was the *Opinion* of the most celebrated *Philosophers* and *Hæreticks* also. But this was fundamentally *destructive* of the *Opinion* of the *Catholick Church* concerning

cerning the *Resurrection*, which proceeds on the Supposal of the *Body's* being a part of the *Man*, and therefore concerned in *sharing* in the *Reward*. This being so, the *Man* is destroyed upon the *Dissolution* of the *Union* between the *Soul* and the *Body*, and is no more concerned in the State of his *separate* Parts, than his own *Body* is in the *separate Elements*, into which it is dissolved in the *Grave*. But on the *Principles* now mentioned, all things are clear. The *Mortal Body* had a *Mortal Soul* join'd to it, which, together with it, made up the *Choical Man*. The $\pi\nu\omicron\eta$ or *Flatus* was *præternatural* to him, as designed to fit him for a *supernatural State of Happiness*. This was to cause the $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\rho\phi\eta$, the *Conversion* of the *Soul* to that *supernatural Principle* of the *Divine Spirit*, by *Union* with which he was to hope for *Immortality*. It was also to enable him for the $\alpha\gamma\lambda\alpha\delta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$, by which the *Union* was to be *begun*, as being it self $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\sigma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ to the *Spirit*, with which the *Union* was designed. And, in the mean time, being it self also of a *Nature Divine* in an *inferiour* Sense, it self was *Immortal* also, and communicated a *derivative Immortality* to the *lower Soul*, so long as the *Union* with the *Soul* was continued; but left it *capable* of the *actual Mortality*, which was *natural* to it, whensoever it should *leave* it. This might be the Case at the *Day of Judgment*,
that

that the *Soul* being *deserted* by the *lower Spirit*, might relapse to the *Mortality* that was natural to it, when it had now no *Body* to support it. This is a clear Account how this *πνὴ* as distinct from the *πνεῦμα*, might put Mankind in that *middle State* between *Mortality* and *Immortality* which the *Fathers* suppose, to be *determined* to either, by the *Event* of his own *Free-will*.

61.
By this
Distinction
on the best
& clearest
Account
may be gi-
ven of the
truly Ca-
tholick
Doctrine
of Original
Sin.

Withal, this *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of the *Human Soul*, clears the *Catholick Doctrine* of *Original Sin* from exposing all Mankind to *Eternal Torments*, even *Infants*, for the *single* and *personal Act* of *Adam*. It was, in truth, that *new Doctrine* of the *natural Immortality*, then *newly espoused*, when the *Pelagian Disputes* began, that forced them upon that *Consequence*. That *Doctrine* obliged them to believe *all Human Souls* concerned in the *general Judgment*, as well those that never *did*, nor *could*, hear of the *Gospel*, as those who *did*. And because they only knew of *two Sentences* then; the one to *Eternal Rewards* and the other to *Eternal Punishments*; and they knew such as never heard of the *Gospel* could not pretend to the *Rewards* of the *Gospel*; they thought the *Consequence* inevitable, that they must consequently be allotted to its *Eternal Punishments*. *S. Augustin* did not here consider, what himself

so frequently grants on other Occasions, that the *contrary* Doctrine of the *Souls natural Mortality*, had then gained so great and numerous Suffrages, that even himself durst not condemn it; nor was he aware of those great and early and *Apostolical Authorities*, that allowed of *Preaching*, and *Believing*, and being *Baptized* in the *separate State*, to leave them *inexcusable* who should fall short of the *Salvation* intended for them, much more those who should incur the *Punishments* which were not intended for them, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. He did not consider how careful God is, where *Punishments* are concerned, especially such *irreparable* ones as admit of no prospect of a *good End*; to purge himself from all *Suspensions* of *absolute Power*, and dealing *arbitrarily*, which yet is the *Subterfuge* he found himself *reduced* to, that he might defend these *Imputations* so *dishonourable* to *Infinite Goodness*: How God *appeals* herein to *Rules of Human Equity*, even to the *Judgment* of the concerned *Persons* themselves, as far as their *Concernment* might be consistent with their *Equity*, to let them see that *themselves* alone were to *blame* for whatever they should suffer by the *Divine Sentence*, and to leave them *inexcusable*. But he did not so concern himself to enquire into *Original Tradition*, as had been requisite in a Case of

of that Importance, but contented himself with *present Authorities*, and *received Opinions*. Nor does he seem very conversant in *Primitive Christian Authors*, even when his Concern against his *Adversaries* obliged him to it. But the *Principles*, now *explained*, give an easie account of the *Catholick Doctrine*. All that *Adam's Posterity* necessarily lost by *Adam's Sin*, was only *præternatural Favour*, and the *Consequences* of it. Their being *deprived* thereby of the *immortalizing Principle*, left them only in that State of *actual Mortality*, which was *natural* to them, and which must *necessarily* have been their Lot, if *God* had not designed them for *Favours* and *Fruitings* beyond their *Nature*, to which the *infinite Goodness*, that is essential to his *Nature*, does not *oblige* him. Their not being *raised* above this *World* to a *Cœlestial State*, as it exposes them to the *Calamities* of this *World*, and to the *Power* of the *Prince of this World*, so far as *God* is pleased to *permit* him to *exercise* his *Power* in it, so it leaves them *capable* of all the *Happiness* in this *World*, to which their prudent Management may entitle them by the *Rules* of his *general Providence*. And their *wanting* the *supernatural Principle* for *subduing* their *Passions*, may expose them to the *Sufferings* in this *World*, which are the *natural Consequences* of *unsubdued Passions*. And, even in the *other World*

the *habitual* Inclinations contracted by an *undisciplin'd Management* in *this Life*, may expose the *Souls*, who have them, to many *Penal Consequences*: to the *Frustrations* of the *Appetites*, and *Aversations* themselves, when they shall be *fixed* and *inflexible*, and yet no *possibility* of *satisfying* them; to the *Indispositions* for *Heaven* and *Heavenly Pleasures*, and *Conversation* with *good Spirits*, and to *Dispositions* to *unreasonable* and *impossible* Designs, and to a *Congruity* of *Inclination* with the *curst Spirits*. Which must accordingly give *them* a more *absolute Power* over such *Souls*, during the *time* of their *Existence*, though that should *not* prove *Eternal*; though it should *not* depress them to the *outer Darkeness*, the *blackness* of *Darkness* reserved for the *Day* of the *general Judgment*. Withal, the *Loss* of the *Divine Image*, first occasioned by *Adam's Fall*, will expose all *Human Souls*, who bear his *Image* (of the *Soul* only, without the *Spirit*) to most of the *Consequences*, commonly believed according to the *received Doctrine* of *Original Sin*, excepting that of *Eternal Punishment*, which cannot be proved by any good *Authorities* before *S. Augustin*; no, not even by those which *S. Austin* has produced for that Purpose. On the contrary, *S. Chrysostom*, as great a *Name* in the *Greek Church*, as *S. Augustin's* was in the *Latin Church*, is full *against* it;

besides the *elder Testimonies* of *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Tertullian*. Here is the *Darkness* of the *Understanding*, commonly observed in the *Modern Systems*, when the *Divine Spirit* is lost, which is called *Light*, from the *Restitution* of which *Spirit* our *Christian Baptism* has the Name of *Illumination*. Thence follows the *Power* of the *Devil* over such *Souls* when they are thus reduced within his *Jurisdiction*, being themselves *Darkness*, and within the *Darkness* of this *World*, of which the *Scripture* stiles him the *Prince*. Thence follows their *Slavery* to *fleshy Lusts*, and the *Body* of *Sin* and *Death*, when they have lost that *supernatural Power* which could alone have enabled them to *subdue* them. Nor can any more, than these things, be *proved* by any clear *Testimonies* of the *truly Catholick Primitive Church*. Whatever is *more*, is only to be ascribed to the *conjectural Consequences* of *S. Augustin*, for which the *truly Catholick Church* ought not, by any means, to be responsible.

62.

The same
Distinction
gives
an easie
account of
the Do-
ctrine of
Reprobation,
so
far as that
Doctrine
is Scrip-
tural.

So also the *Doctrine* of *Reprobation* is easily accounted for by these same *Principles*. *Reprobation in massa purâ*, has no *Countenance* in *Scriptures*: no, nor in *Reasoning*, but by that *absolute Arbitrary Power*, which is every where *renounced* by *God* in his *Expostulations*, concerning the *Equity* of his *Proceedings* with *Mankind*. And the *Foundation* of *Reprobation* to *Eternal Torments*,

ments, even in *massâ corruptâ*, is overthrown by what I have now said, to shew, that even *Adam's Sin* makes no Man, as he descends from him, liable to *Eternal Punishment*: because the *ἐκὼν* derived from him, is, by the *Apostle* himself, supposed *Mortal*; and therefore cannot *qualifie* the Person, so descending from him, to *subsist* under a *Punishment* that would otherwise, in regard of the *Efficient*, by which it had been inflicted, have been *Eternal*. The most tolerable Account of this melancholy Doctrine, is that which makes *Reprobation* not a *positive Decree* for *damning* the *greatest* part of *Mankind* *eternally*; but rather a *Negative*, a *Præterition*, a *Non-election*, or *not taking in* to the number of *God's Favourites* and *chosen People*. This is indeed intelligible, and reconcilable with the essential *Goodness* of *God*, if even this *Præterition* have no worse *Consequence* than the *Deprivation* of Persons, so passed by, of such *Advantages* only, as are the *Privileges* of *Favourites*. But the *Doctrine* of the *natural Immortality* of the *Soul*, makes *Eternal Misery* a *Consequence* of that *Præterition*, as *inevitable* to the Persons concerned in it, as if they had been *predestinated* to it by a *Positive Decree*. For it makes them necessarily concerned in *one* of the *Eternal States*, to which *Men*, are to be sentenced at the *final Judgment*.

ment. And this for *Conditions* which God was never pleased to put in their Power, though withal he, at the same time, knew that they were *not*, in their Power naturally. In this Case, to *pass them by*, was necessarily to conclude them under the contrary Sentence of *Eternal Condemnation*. But this is easily avoided, supposing the Nature of the Soul Mortal. God may certainly *chuse* what Nations or Persons he pleases, for his *preternatural Favours*, without *derogating* from his Attribute of Goodness. And he may as *freely* pass others by, and *not admit* them. And all the *Consequence* of such a *Pretermiſſion*, in reference to *Supernatural Favours*, would be to leave them intirely to their own Nature, which, as it would admit of no *Immortal Enjoyments*, so neither of *Immortal Calamities*. Here is nothing *harsh*, or *difficult*, or *irreconcilable* with God's other Attributes.

63.

It gives
withal, the
easiest ac-
count of
the Justice
of Eter-
nal Tor-
ments.

It is also another of the *greatest Difficulties* in our *Modern Theology*, to give a Reason why the *Sins of finite Creatures* should be punished with *endless Torments*. I know the *Schools* have invented several; but such as were as well *unknown* to the *Antients*; as they are in themselves *unsatisfactory*. I cannot now allow my self *Respite* to descend to *Particulars*. The most plausible I take to be, that which is given by *Dr. Hammond*, that of *Option*. Nor can

see any thing *harsh*, if God be pleased to oblige us to accept of *Eternal Pleasures* under *Pain*, if we do not, of incurring *Eternal Punishments*. It is rather agreeable to his *Goodness* to oblige us to be happy, by such means as he knows most efficacious with our *reasonable Natures*. And *Punishments* are indeed so, and are accordingly *threaten'd* by all prudent *Legislators*, as the greatest *Securities* for having those *Laws* punctually observ'd, which are of the greatest *Moment* for the *Publick*. Such is the *Disingenuity* of our *lapsed Human Nature*. But then that *Reasoning* of the excellent *Dr.* can only take place in such Cases as are really *capable of Option*. Which cannot be pretended in *Infants dying Unbaptized*; nor in *Heathens*, who never heard of the *Gospel*. These could not make a *Choice* of either, who neither *knew* that it was in their *Power* to be *eternally Happy*, nor that God had *obliged* them to *make a Choice*. Much less, that he had done so on so *severe Terms*, as to make their *Neglect* of it *Pœnal eternally*. That *Hypothesis* therefore can give no reason why either of *these* should be liable to such a *Punishment*. Nor indeed, can any better *Reason* be given, why they should be so *punished*. Nor is the *Scripture* clear in either *Instance*, that it *shall* be their *Case*. Still it is the *received Opinion* concerning the *Soul's natural Immortality*

that has perplexed our *Modern* Divines on these Subjects. But, if God be pleased to leave *both* of them to that *Mortality*, which is *natural* to both of them, there is nothing *harsh*, in either Case, that can justly be *complained* of. Yet *Infants* may have the Benefit of their *Innocence* (*Reward* they cannot pretend to) even in their *separate* State. They may thereby be qualified for *Conversation* with *good Spirits*, and *indisposed* for receiving the *Harm* of the *ill Offices* of those that are *malignant*. And those *good Angels*, whom the *Antients* believed to be intrusted with the *Patronage* of *Children* at their *Nativity*, and which our Saviour himself alludes to and owns as well as they, may as well protect them in their *separate* State, as they do in their *Bodies*, and secure them from being *miserable* in *either* State, though their Condition be not so *happy* as it *might* have been, if they had been *baptized*. The *Air* between *Earth* and *Heaven* (which was the "*Adns* of the *Antients*") was taken to be the *common Receptacle* of *Souls*, both *good* and *bad*, till the *Resurrection*; and of *good Spirits*, as well as *bad*, as God was pleased to *permit* the one or *order* the other. However, the *Devil* is the *Prince* only of the *Darkness* of the *Air*, and the *Souls* that are there, are no otherwise *subject* to him, than as they also are *Darkness*, as indeed
the

the *Scripture* supposes them to be, before they are *illuminated* by the *Baptismal Spirit*. Yet that does not hinder, but that they may receive *Irradiations* and *Assistances*, and many other *good Offices*, from the *good Spirits* which are supposed ordinarily to converse *there*, as well as the *Devils*. Exactly on the same account as they did whilst they were here on *Earth*, which being *lower*, should therefore be more obnoxious to the *Power* of the *Devil*, as he is the *God* of *this World*. And, by the same *Reasoning*, the *Air* may have more of the Conversation of *good Spirits*, as being *nearer* Heaven, the place of their *constant* residence. This may make their *separate* Condition, for the time of their Duration, more *happy* than it was in *this World*, notwithstanding the *Power* the *Devil* is supposed to have over them whilst they are within his *Jurisdiction*; because his *Power* so limited in this World, is so limited by the *Laws* of *Providence*, and the Interposition of *good Spirits*. And indeed so *happy*, as abundantly to make *amends* for the *Infelicities* such *good Heathens* may have suffered in *this Life*, though they should not be *immortalized*, nor have any share in those *Eternal Rewards* which are to follow after the *Day* of *Judgment*, as the *Prerogative* of the *new Peculium*. The *Happiness* of the *intermediate* Space between

X 4

their

their *Death* and the *Judgment*, may sufficiently reward the Sufferings of so short a *Life*, as *ours* is, and give them just occasion to glorifie the *Bounty* of their Creator to them, though he has not been pleased to advance them to the *highest* Rank of *Favourites*: Yet, though even *this* had been necessary, which no *Attribute* can prove so: I have also shewn how *God* may, by means *unknown* to us, put it in their *Power* to attain this *greater Honour*, by allowing them the Benefit of a *Baptism* in their *separate* State, with the *means* necessary to qualify them for it, of *Preaching* and *Faith*. And for the *Fact*, that he *has* done so, I have produced great *Authorities* in the *freshest* Memory of *Apostolical Tradition*. And I have endeavoured to prove all so, as to give no *Advantage* to any who might reckon on the like *Favour now*, to the Prejudice of *Ordinary Discipline*, since that *Discipline* has been *established*. That *Extreme* ought certainly to be provided against by such as would reason, solidly and prudently, as well as the other of *Uncharitableness*. It can no more be true *Charity* that is inconsistent with *God's positive Institutions*, and the *Discipline* settled by them, and that allows Men to hope for the same *Favours* in the *Neglect*, or even *Contempt*, of that *Discipline*, than it can be *Discipline* that interferes with the *Offices* of *true Charity*.

Thus

Thus I have given you, worthy Sir, my ^{64.}
Reasons why this *Distinction* of Soul and Spirit seems to me neither *Unscriptural* nor *Uncatholick*: but on the contrary, more agreeable both to *Scripture*, and the Fountains of *Apostolical Tradition*, than those *contrary* Opinions or Explications which are advanced in *Opposition* to it in our *Modern Systems*. You will thereby find that most of your *Objections* proceed on a *Mistake* of the *Catholick Doctrine* and my *meaning* in this Matter. I think I have cleared it from those ill *Consequences* and *Scandals* wherewith you thought it chargeable. I have also shewn, what you seem to *grant*, the great *Usefulness* of it for solving several of the most *difficult Questions* in our *late Divinity*; which might alone suffice to *recommend* it to the *Favour* of all Well-wishers to our common *Religion*, though it had no *other* Evidence of its being *true*. Yet I am willing to hear what you or any *other* Friend can say to convince me, if I should prove mistaken. I am (though unkown)

Yours affectionately,

HENRY DODWELL.

H
mi
by
ni
S.
ac
nu

A
CATALOGUE
OF
BOOKS

Printed for *Richard Smith*, at the *Angel* and
Bible without *Temple-Bar* ; Where Gentles-
men may be furnished with all sorts of
NEW BOOKS that come out, and have
ready Money for any Library, of what Lan-
guage soever.

BOOKS in Folio,

Just publish'd,

Ezechielis Spanhemii Liberi Baronis & Legati
Regii Dissertationes de Præstantia & usu Nu-
mismatum Antiquorum Editio Nova. Price 2l in Q.
Georgii Bullii, S. Theologiæ Professoris & Pres-
byteri Anglicani (nunc Episcopi Menev.) Opera om-
nia ; quibus duo præcipui Catholice fidei Articuli de
S. Trinitate & Justificatione, Orthodoxè, perspicuè
ac solide explanantur, illustrantur, confirmantur ;
nunc demum in unum Volumen collecta, ac multo
cor-

correctius quam ante ; una cum generalibus Indicibus edita. Quibus jam accessit ejusdem Tractatus hactenus ineditus de Primitiva & Apostolica Traditione dogmatis de Jesu Christi Divinitate, contra Danielem Zuickerum ejusq; ruperos in Anglia Sectatores ; subnexa insuper pluribus singulorum librorum capitibus prolixa quandoq; Annotata Joannis Ernesti Grabe, hujus etiam Præfatio huic Volumini est Premissa, Lond. 1703. Price Bound 1 l. 10 s.

The Arguments and Reports of S. Henry Pollexfen Kt. late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, in some special Cases by him argued during the time of his Practice at the Bar, together with divers Decrees in the High Court of Chancery upon Limitation of Trusts of Terms for Years ; the whole Printed from the Author's Original Manuscript. Revised and Corrected with his own hand, and publish'd with the allowance and approbation of the Lord-Keeper, and all the Judges Price, 1 l.

3. S. Orl. Bridgman's Conveyances, being select Precedents of Deeds, and Instruments concerning the most considerable Estates in England, drawn and approv'd by that Honourable Person in the time of his Practice. The second Volume carefully Corrected, to which is added a Table, and every particular Covenant noted in the Margin, to which it refers, Pr. 9 s.

4. Chirurgia Curiosa, or, the newest and most Curious Observations and Operations in the whole Art of Chirurgery, written originally in High-Dutch, by Matthæus Gothofredus Parmanus, chief Chirurgeon of the City of Breslaw in Germany, and of the Hospitals of S. Job, and All Saints. Illustrated with large Chirurgical Figures, of Patients as well as Instruments invented

vented by Dr. Solingen, curiously Engraven on Copper Plates. To which is added, *Natura morborum medicatrix*, Or, Nature Cures Diseases ; wherein the Energy of Nature is demonstrated, her Operations explained, and her various steps rendered intelligible. By *Conrade Joachim Sprengell*, M. Physio-didactus. Pr. 12. s.

BOOKS in Quarto.

1. The New Art of Spelling design'd chiefly for Persons of Maturity, teaching them how to Spell and Write Words by the sound thereof, and to sound and read Words by the sight thereof, Rightly, Neatly and Fashionably, By *J. Jones*, M. D. Price 2 s. 6 d.

2. *Solon*, or Philosophy no defence against Love, a Tragi-Comedy, with the Masque of *Orpheus* and *Eurydice*, written by *Capt. Bladen*, Price 1 s. 6 d.

3. The History of the Campaign in *Germany*, for the Year 1704. under the Command of his Grace the Duke of *Marlborough* Captain General of Her Majesties Forces, with an impartial Account of the two famous Battles of *Schellenburgh* and *Blenheim*, and the Lists of the Killed and Wounded and taken Prisoners, from the time of his Grace's setting out to his Return to *White-Hall*, the second Edit. Price 1 s.

4. Good Advice to the Ladies, shewing, that as the World goes, and is like to go, the best way for them is to keep unmarried ; a Satyr, with the Character of a *Beau*, Written by *Dan. de Foe*, 2d. Edit. 1706. Pr. 6 d.

5. The

5. The King of *Prussia's* Right to the Principality of *Orange*, stated; Published by the Order of the Baron *Spanheim* 1703. Price 1 s.

English BOOKS in Octavo.

1. The Mysteries of *Opium* reveal'd, by Dr. *Jones*, Chancellour of *Landaff*, and Member of the College of Physicians, and formerly Fellow of *Christs College* in *Oxford*, Pr. 5 s.

2. Paraphrase and Annotations on all *S. Paul's* Epistles, done by several Eminent Men at *Oxford*, Corrected and Improved by the late Reverend and Learned Bp. *Fell*. Price 6s.

3. *C. Julius Caesar's* Commentaries, of his War in *Gaul* and Civil War with *Pompey*, to which is added *Anlus Hirtius Opus's*, Supplement of the *Alexandrian*, *African* and *Spanish* War, with the Author's Life, adorned with Sculptures, from the designs of the famous *Paladio*, made English by Capt. *Bladen*, Price 8 s.

4. *Beaumont's* Historical, Philosophical and Theological Treatise of Spirits, Apparitions, Witches, and other Magical Practices; containing an account of the *Genii*, or, Familiar Spirits both Good and Bad, that are said to attend Men in this Life, Price 5 s.

5. The Antient Religion of the *Gentiles* and Causes of their Errors considered, the Mistakes and Failures of the Heathen Priests, and Wise Men in their Notions of the Deity, and Matters of Divine Worship, are examin'd, with regard to their being altogether destitute of Divine Revelation; with a compleat Index. By the Learned and Judicious *Edward Lord Herbert*, of *Cherbury*, &c. Price 5 s.

6. *Boccalini's*

6. *Boccaline's Works* compleat in 5. Vol. English'd by Capt. *Bladen*, Price 1 l. 1 s. 6 d.

7. *History of Charles the Vth. Emperour and King of Spain*, the great Heroe of the House of *Austria*, containing the most remarkable Occurrences that happen'd in the World for the space of 56 Years, all Nations being in greater or less measure engaged in the Contests and Confusions of those times; Translated from the *Spanish*, Price 6 s.

8. Bp. of *Cambray's Characters and Criticisms on the Antient and Modern Orators, Poets, Painters, Musicians, Statuaries, and other Arts and Sciences*; to which it added a Poem, in Blank Verse, Entitled, the Age of *Lewis the Great*, Price 3 s. 6 d.

9. *Theory of Sciences illustrated, or the Grounds and Principles of the seven Liberal Arts*, by *Hen. Curson*, Gent. Price 5 s.

10. *Several Discourses Preached on particular occasions before the State, in the Cathedral Church of S. Patrick and Christ-Church, Dublin*; by *Will. Sheridan*, Ld. Bp. of *Kilmore and Ardagh*, Price 5 s.

11. *Christian Perfection*, consisting in the Love of God explained, in several Letters to a Lady, Price 5 s.

12. *The Vanity of Conquests and Universal Monarchy*, being a succinct account of all the great Heroes both of Ancient and Modern Ages, deduced from *Nimrod* to *Lewis the XIVth.* of France, by *Geo. Smith*, Esq; Price 5 s.

13. *Dodwell's Occasional Communion*, fundamentally destructive of the Discipline of the Primitive Catholick Church, and contrary to the

the Doctrine of the latest Scriptures, concerning Church-Communion, Price 2 s. 6 d.

14. — *De Schismate Anglicano Parcenesis ad Exteros tam Reformatos, quam etiam Pontificios qua Jura Episcoporum vetera eorundemque à Magistratu seculare Independentia omnibus afferenda commendantur*, Price 4 s.

15. — *Exercitationes duæ de Ætate Phalaridis & Pythagoræ*, Price 2 s.

16. — *Conference between Soul and Body*, Price 2 s.

17. *Tale of a Tub revers'd, for the universal Improvement of Mankind*, Price 1 s. 6 d.

18. *Reflections of our common Failings*, Price 2 s.

Abstract of the most curious Thoughts of Signiour Montaign.

In the Press and Speedily will be publish'd.

The Alexandrian Septuagint, Printed at Oxford, publish'd by the Reverend and Learned Dr. Grabe. PROPOSALS given out, and Subscriptions taken in by Richard Smith, at the Angel and Bible without Temple Bar.